

5.22.22.

From the Library of
Professor Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield
Bequeathed by him to
the Library of
Princeton Theological Seminary

BX 5199 .W85 W9
Wordsworth, John, 1843-1911
The episcopate of Charles
Wordsworth, Bishop of St.

WORKS BY CHARLES WORDSWORTH, D.D.

Late Bishop of St. Andrews.

ANNALS OF MY EARLY LIFE, 1806-1846. 8vo. 15s.

ANNALS OF MY LIFE, 1847-1856. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

PRIMARY WITNESS TO THE TRUTH OF THE
GOSPEL: a Series of Discourses. Also a Charge on Modern Teaching on the Canon of the Old Testament. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

CATECHESIS: or, Christian Instruction preparatory to Confirmation and First Communion. Fifth Edition. Small 8vo. 2s.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., 39 Paternoster Row, London
New York and Bombay.

THE EPISCOPATE
OF
CHARLES WORDSWORTH



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015



1843

Walter J. Lewis '14

C. Woodworth
Rev. Mr. Andrews

THE EPISCOPATE
OF
CHARLES WORDSWORTH

BISHOP OF ST ANDREWS, DUNKELD, AND DUNBLANE

1853 - 1892

A MEMOIR

TOGETHER WITH SOME MATERIALS FOR
FORMING A JUDGMENT ON THE GREAT QUESTIONS IN THE
DISCUSSION OF WHICH HE WAS CONCERNED

BY
JOHN WORDSWORTH, D.D.
BISHOP OF SALISBURY

WITH PORTRAITS

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1899

PREFACE

CHARACTER AND DESCRIPTION OF THE MATERIALS.

I HAVE undertaken to sketch the Episcopate of Bishop Charles Wordsworth, my father's elder brother, which extended over nearly forty years from his consecration on St. Paul's Day, 25 January, 1853, to his death 5 December, 1892. I am conscious of many deficiencies in undertaking this serious task, and especially the absence of anything like continuous familiarity with the country in and for which he had worked so long. But the sympathy which comes from close relationship, kindred duties, and common aims, and from a genuine but, I believe, unbiassed admiration of his character, may be pleaded as my justification in doing so. The request to undertake this duty came to me, shortly after my uncle's death, from his two sons, Robert Walter and William Barter Wordsworth, who were appointed by him executors of his will, and who confided to my care all the papers necessary for its full completion. I have tried their patience in its fulfilment, but their patience has been as generous as their confidence. They and their sisters have also given me much real help in collecting material, and in revising the proofs of this volume.

Those who read these pages will probably, in most cases, be already familiar with the two volumes of 'Auto-

biographical Annals,' which proceeded from his own pen ; one published during his lifetime, the other in the spring that followed his death. The second of these volumes—edited by a Fifeshire man of letters, Mr. W. Earl Hodgson, with whom the Bishop had made friends in the later years of his life—covered the period from 1847 to 1856, and thus embraced the first three years of his episcopate. But I have thought it desirable to include those years also in this volume in order to give unity to it, and to enable it to take an independent position in the world of books. My method naturally omits certain details which would have place in an autobiography, and attempts something more of an exterior judgment on the character and issues of the Bishop's public acts. Indeed, I have thought it wise to summarise, very briefly, the events of all the preceding years for the benefit of those readers who might not have the 'Annals' at hand, and thus to prefix the most necessary and fundamental facts of his biography to the most important part of it.

In writing this sketch of his episcopate I have had the advantage of his own careful preparation. This preparation included a skeleton of three chapter headings, certain paragraphs specially written, and references to other paragraphs contained in five small oblong note-books, in which he jotted down his views on different topics as they occurred to him.¹ Some of these paragraphs are rough and incomplete, some of them written and re-written in several forms, while all would clearly have been subjected to his own revision. I have, therefore, not thought it necessary in all cases to reproduce them word for word, but where I have done so I have distinguished them by printing them, like the letters or extracts from books and letters, in smaller type. In addition to these there is a

¹ These are cited, as by himself, as MS. i.-v.

nearly complete series of small S.P.C.K. almanacks with notes of engagements and occasionally a few more interesting memoranda. There is also a larger note-book¹ containing only a few pages of material, but what there is is important. It is a sort of index to the five note-books, under paragraph headings.

His correspondence was carefully separated by himself chiefly into years and partly also into subjects, but it unfortunately does not contain so many of his own letters as could be wished. For the latter I have had to depend upon the affection and courtesy of friends who have been good enough to send them to his sister-in-law and intimate friend, Miss Mary Barter, whose beautiful penmanship, unwearied labour, and keen intelligence were constantly at his disposal throughout his life, and who has aided and encouraged me during the years in which this task has been in my hands. Her death, after a long and painful illness, between its completion and the publication of this volume, has been the removal of a bright example from our midst. For such material I have specially to thank the late Earl of Selborne,² Dean Boyle, Archdeacon Aglen, Canon George Venables, the late Professor Milligan, Dean J. S. Wilson of Edinburgh, Revs. W. Tuckwell and W. M. Meredith, and Messrs. John A. Spens and W. Earl Hodgson. I have also some specially interesting notes of his later years from Canon G. T. Farquhar, and generous assistance from other clergy of the diocese such as Rev. J. W. Hunter of Birnam, Canon Douglas of Kirriemuir, and Dean Rorison, and from kind neighbours like Mrs.

¹ Lettered VIRGIL, vol. ii. I have cited it as *Note-book*.

² I have a letter from him to my cousin, R. W. Wordsworth, dated 'Gledstone, Shipton-in-Craven, 8 November, 1893,' giving permission for the use of his *Recollections*. He also kindly sent a number of letters to Miss M. Barter for my use. The present Earl has also kindly sanctioned the use of the letter quoted on p. 195-6.

Smythe of Methven, and Lord Rollo, and many friends at St. Andrews, especially Professor Knight; also from Provost Ball of Cumbrae. If I have not, in many cases, quoted their material at length, I have had it all in mind.

But, after all, the chief materials are to be found in the Bishop's printed writings, which are very numerous and full of varied interest, although he left no great monumental work.

I have before me a list of some forty Charges and Synodal Addresses drawn up by himself in 1891, all of them delivered in person, and all, except one or two, printed in some form. I do not reprint the list here, as the contents practically form part of Appendix VII., pp. 366–385; but it is an extraordinary record of diligent performance of duty. Every one of the papers attains a high standard of literary excellence, and, considering how persistently he pursued certain subjects, there is great variety in their treatment.

The greater part of these Charges, with other printed documents, he caused to be bound up into eight volumes in dark cloth. The first is a 4to, lettered C. W. 1851–1887, and contains sheets of articles from the 'Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal' and other newspapers, 'Notes on the Eucharistic Controversy, with Supplement' (1858), addresses and papers on the case of St. Ninian's, 'Articles of Presentment' against himself (1873), fly-sheets on the 'Eastward Position' (1874), 'In re Burntisland' (1876), 'Final Suggestions on New Testament Revision, the Four Gospels' (1879), and others.

The second is an imperial 8vo, lettered C. W. 1878–1888, and containing four magazine articles by himself.

The third, fourth, fifth, and sixth are in ordinary 8vo, and are lettered C. W., vols. i., ii., iii., iv., and contain the great mass of his Charges, pamphlets, sermons, &c.

The seventh and eighth are in small 8vo or 12mo, similarly bound and lettered C. W., vol. i., and C. W., vol. ii., and contain nearly all the remaining publications not separately bound on their publication.

Many of these were reprinted in two volumes, published in 1886, at Edinburgh, under the title 'Public Appeals in behalf of Christian Unity with reference to the Present Condition of the Church in Scotland.' The introductions prefixed to each of the twelve numbers are very valuable as materials for his biography, and it is on this account that these volumes are mentioned here.

To the matter already described must be added collections of fugitive pieces, epitaphs, epigrams, short poems, newspaper cuttings, and printed letters. The Bishop made it a habit, and indeed considered it a duty, to write letters to the newspapers, sometimes in his own name, sometimes with a 'nom de plume,' and he preserved nearly everything of this kind that he wrote. There is therefore no lack of material; but what I have lacked in using it has been the time to acquire sufficient insight into so large a mass, and the capacity always to choose what would give colour and reality to the memoir, and at the same time be of permanent interest. I have, however, attempted to gain both knowledge of persons and places for myself, so as to speak less as an outsider. Besides a visit to Perth as a boy, in the year of the Manchester Exhibition, I spent some happy days with my uncle at Edinburgh in the year 1885, and again at St. Andrews in October 1888, when I had the honour to preach at the meeting of the Representative Church Council at Dundee, and made the acquaintance of the Primus and others of the clergy and laity of our Communion. Since his death I have visited Scotland three times, mainly for the purpose of gaining an insight into matters connected with this book—first early in 1893, when I also went over to Aberdeen and

made acquaintance with Dr. Milligan and Dr. Cooper ; next in the summer and autumn of 1895, when I spent a number of weeks in the diocese, making my headquarters at Comrie, near Crieff ; and lastly in 1896, when I also visited Edinburgh and Glasgow, mainly for the purpose of becoming personally acquainted with such of the Presbyterian clergy as were likely to be friendly to my uncle's great design. In this way I have visited nearly all the places mentioned in this volume except the Highland centres. Besides Perth and St. Andrews, which I have visited several times, I may mention Methven, Crieff, Comrie, St. Fillans, Duncrub, Muthill, Dunblane, Ardoch (Stirling), Dunkeld and Birnam, Forfar, Glamis, Alyth and Meigle, Kirriemuir and Dunfermline, and I have friends and correspondents at nearly all of them.

With regard to a feature of the book which may seem to need some explanation, viz. my own remarks upon the questions on which the subject of this Memoir exercised his remarkable powers, I may say that they have cost me even more thought and care than the remainder of the volume. I could not forget that, though belonging to a younger generation, I have a duty as a Bishop to teach which it is hardly ever possible to set aside, especially in handling such weighty questions. Secondly, in order to do justice to my uncle's own principles, I felt it necessary not simply to say that I could not in every respect agree with him, but to indicate the limits within which I have ventured to differ from him. A general disclaimer of agreement might easily be interpreted to mean much more than I intended, whereas by pointing out the very large amount of agreement and the subordinate character of the difference, I am free to do all in my power to further his objects, which were much dearer to his heart than his methods. This is especially true of the two great subjects

to which he devoted his strength—the Eucharistic Controversy and the Reunion Movement. While I cannot accept as final all his language or all his practical conclusions on these subjects, I perceive that he had certain true principles in view which have been obscured or overlooked by others to the detriment of the Church, especially in the heat of controversy. In regard to the Eucharist, his great wish was to preserve the true ‘proportions of the faith:’ in regard to Reunion, to make it clear that some concessions are necessary on our part under the peculiar circumstances of Scottish Presbyterianism. I trust that readers of this Memoir will agree with me not only that he acted conscientiously in regard to both, but that he was right in emphasising both the general principle in the one case and the practical duty in the other.

I have in the last chapter made a selection of the lighter matter which lay to hand. In doing this I have had to lay aside not a little that was of interest, sometimes from one motive, sometimes from another. My uncle was, as far as English verse went, strongest in epigram or satire, and this is not generally the fairest permanent representation of a man’s character; and the Latin verse, of which he was a master, may be represented sufficiently by specimens. His graceful epigraphs, dedications, epitaphs, and the like are well known to readers of the ‘Annals,’ and of less interest apart from the books or places to which they belong. I should like to have added more letters of Bishop Claughton’s, but the best of them are too outspoken and familiar for publication. Unfortunately, only few of his own letters to Claughton have been preserved. Others of his correspondents put questions or cases in an interesting way, but their letters are not complete without his answers. Others belong to phases of controversy which it is inexpedient to pursue in detail.

I have made an attempt at a Bibliography in which I have endeavoured to steer between the two extremes of exhaustiveness and severity. I have included every separately printed document of which I was cognisant, a rule which appears to me the only safe guide, especially if such a task is to supplement an imperfect Memoir like the present. A mere fly-sheet often supplies an important date. On the other hand, I have purposely omitted many letters to newspapers, while I have included those that seemed to be most important, either as containing fresh matter, or as incidentally showing his vigour and vigilance, or as elucidating the course of events.

But, if any reader detects the absence of any separate publication or privately printed document or fly-sheet, I shall be grateful for information on such points; and also for any notices of articles or reviews published by the Bishop in periodicals, or of sermons of his in series by different writers, which I have failed to insert. I have not attempted to record the date of every edition of the Greek Grammar, but I should be grateful for any early copies that friends may have to dispose of, especially that of 1843.

I have learnt much in the course of this work; and, if I can succeed in carrying my reader along with me, I do not doubt that he too, if he is a gentle and sympathetic reader, will at least learn something. He will take an interest in the Bishop's personality and in the development of his character under somewhat difficult and trying circumstances. He will find that the questions with which he was occupied, though local in their immediate bearings, really concern the whole Church, and were treated by him in a manner worthy of the great issues that attach to them.

JOHN SARUM.

Feast of the Presentation of Christ in the Temple,

2 Feb. 1899.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE : Character and Description of the Materials	v

CHAPTER I

EARLY LIFE—ELECTION TO THE SEE OF ST. ANDREWS
1806-1853

‘ Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might.’

Birth and Baptism	1
Harrow (1820), Oxford, Christ Church (1825)	2
Character and accomplishments	2
Private tutor (1830)	2
Remarkable pupils	2
Travels (1833-34)	2
Ordained Deacon 21 December, 1834	2
Second Master of Winchester	2
Marriage (29 December 1835)	2
Death of wife (10 May, 1839)	3
Ordained Priest (13 December, 1840)	3
Relation to Oxford Movement	3
Influence at Winchester	4
Death of Christopher Wordsworth, sen., 2 February, 1846	4
Charles Wordsworth resigns his second Mastership	4
Gladstone's visit	4
Glenalmond	4
Second marriage (28 October, 1846)	4
Glenalmond opened 4 May, 1847	5
Consecration of chapel (1 May, 1851)	5
Warden of Glenalmond (May 1847 to July 1854)	5
Elected Bishop 30 November, 1852, consecrated 25 January, 1853	5
Circumstances of the election	5

	PAGE
Unfortunate opposition	6
Strangeness of it	9
His views	9
His opposition to the 'Cathedral Party' on Bishop Torry's Prayer Book	10
Character of that Book (April 1850)	10
Storms raised by it	13
His strenuous action in censuring it	14
His strong defence of the principle of Establishment	15
His opposition to Gladstone	16
His own words (MS. i. 3 foll.)	17
Outspokenness of antagonism in those days	17
His qualities enable him to bear opposition	18
Simplicity of faith and confidence in his own ideas	19
A certain severity and impetuosity and critical instinct stand in his way	19
But serene and large in his views	20

CHAPTER II

THE DIOCESE AND THE BISHOP

'Manus ad clavum : oculus ad cœlum.'

The united Diocese 'the fairest portion of the Northern Kingdom'	21
Late origin of Diocesan Episcopacy in Scotland	22
Rise of the Bishops living at St. Andrews	23
Patrick Graham first Archbishop (1472)	24
Short and tragic succession	25
Dunkeld and Dunblane	25
His own retrospect in 1868	26
Title of St. Andrews in abeyance from 1704 to 1844	27
Episcopalians tied their own hands by the 'Assertory Act,' 1669	27
Extent and features of the Diocese	27
Its boundaries and river basins	28
Splendid site of Perth	28
Charm of St. Andrews	28
Other centres—Dunkeld, Dunblane, Abernethy, Glamis, Forfar, Dunfermline, Kinross	29
Character of the people	31
Mixture of Highland and Lowland characteristics	31
Interest of the country to the Bishop from family traditions	31
The Poet Wordsworth and Bishop Horsley	31
Conditions of the separation	32

	PAGE
The Episcopal Church has a right to territorial titles, yet has a scant hold on the population	32
Smallness of his flock in 1853	33
Strength of Presbyterian organisation	33
Character of the people illustrated by the humorous and pathetic sketches of modern writers	34
Quotations from Wordsworth's 'Resolution and Independence' and from his description of the 'Wanderer'	35
The Bishop's great desire to create a united Church	37
Threefold duty realised: (1) To prevent the capture of the Episcopal Church by an English party; (2) Duty to convince the Scottish understanding of the claims of Episcopacy; (3) Duty of making concessions: this emerged last	37
Sketch of the working of these three convictions	38

CHAPTER III

EARLY EPISCOPATE

1854-1856

'Crescunt dona, crescunt rationes.'

Early residence at Perth: its situation in the Diocese	40
Early history of St. Ninian's (1849-50)	42
Statutes approved by Bishop Torry (1851)	43
Attempt to transfer an English institution to Scotland	45
Character of Provost Fortescue	46
His retirement in 1871	48
Character of Precentor Humble	49
His fighting qualities	50
Lay control of Cathedral	51
The Bishop attempts successfully to make the Cathedral more Diocesan	51
Changes in 1853	52
Canon G. T. Farquhar's Summary	52
Enthronement	55
Building of St. Ninian's	55
Other Churches in Perth	56
Primary Charge of 1854	57
Acknowledgment of Presbyterian Baptism	58
Follows Hooker and Bingham in agreement with Bishop Forbes of Brechin	58
The author's judgment on the question	60

	PAGE
The Charge well received	64
Visitations combined with Synod (1854-58)	64
Bishop takes charge of Muthill (1854-55)	65
Beginnings of the Eucharistic controversy in Scotland	66
Originated in England (1853-54)	66
Attacks upon the Scottish Office	67
'Three Short Sermons on the Holy Communion:' their value	67
Extracts from them	68
Charles Wordsworth's attitude to the Scottish Office at various times (1855, 1858, 1859, 1862, 1884, 1889)	73
The abrupt formula of Invocation in it, introduced in 1764, unscriptural and unliturgical	74
Suggestions for its amendment	76
His final judgment	78
The Bishop at Birnam Cottage, Dunkeld	80
Moves to Pitcullen Bank, Perth. End of Annals (August 1856)	81
Trinity College becomes extra-diocesan	82
'Papal aggression in the East'	82
The Feu House, Perth (1858). The Bishop's taste	82

CHAPTER IV

THE EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY AND ST. NINIAN'S

1857-1860

'The truth exploring with an equal mind,
 In doctrine and communion they have sought
 Firmly between the two extremes to steer;
 But theirs the wise man's ordinary lot,
 To trace right courses for the stubborn blind,
 And prophesy to ears that will not hear.'

WM. WORDSWORTH, *Eccles. Sonnets*, ii. 40.

Bishop Forbes' 'Primary Charge' (1857)	84
Its connection with the controversy in England	85
Previous works of Pusey and Keble	86
Summary of the Charge: the Presence, Adoration, Sacrifice; Scottish Office	87
The Charge naturally creates excitement	95
Part taken by Bishop of St. Andrews reserved and laborious and tending to united action	96
The Charge discussed in the Episcopal Synod	97
Agitation. 'Three Bishops' Declaration'	100
Keble's 'Letter' to the Primus	101

	PAGE
Clerical and lay addresses	101
Publication of Mr. Cheyne's 'Six Sermons' (February 1858)	
prevents a settlement	102
Their aggressive character	103
Mr. Cheyne presented to Bishop Suther	106
His attempted restriction on the parties	107
'Synodal Letter' of 25 May, 1858, drafted by Bishop of St. Andrews and signed by all Bishops but Forbes (p. 349)	108
Comments on it by W. B. Barter and Christopher Wordsworth	110
The Bishop's explanatory letter to Sir A. Edmonstone	111
R. Palmer's 'Opinion'	113
Bishop Trower's 'Pastoral' Keble's 'Considerations'	114
Mr. Cheyne suspended at Aberdeen (August 1858)	115
Bishop of St. Andrews' 'Notes on the Eucharistic Contro- versy.' Summary of them	115
Pacific Charge of 1858	118
Mr. Cheyne's first appeal to the Bishops	119
Death of Rev. William B. Barter	121
His Character	121
Mr. Cheyne's obstinacy	122
His second trial (May 1859), appeal, and sentence (November 1859)	123
His restoration (1863)	124
Rupture between the Bishop and the Chapter of St. Ninian's	124
History of their relations	125
Bishop's view of his position in the Cathedral	126
Mr. J. D. Chambers's 'Opinion'	127
Perth Cathedral School and the 'Cathedral Declaration'	128
Bishop announces his withdrawal (May 1859)	128
More outspoken Charge of September 1859	129
Eastward position given up	129
Pamphlets of Mr. Humble and Mr. Lendrum	130
Legal proceedings against Bishop Forbes (October 1859)	131
His 'Letter to the Congregation of St. Paul's, Dundee'	131
Anonymous 'Proposals for Peace' by Bishop of St. Andrews: Language of Anglican and Scottish divines	131
Further proceedings	133
Interview with Keble (8 February 1860)	133
Judgment in the case (15 March 1860)	134
The Bishop of St. Andrews' own remarks	135
George Forbes' approval of his 'Opinion'	136
The question at issue, 'is there a Real Presence on the Altar, in the Elements, and a repetition or continuation of the Sacri- fice of the Cross?'	136
Criticism of this position from Scripture and antiquity	137

	PAGE
Quotation from his 'Opinion,' on the Melchizedckian Priesthood	138
The writer's own judgment	140
There is a 'disturbance of the proportions of faith' in the doctrine of adoration of Christ 'in the gifts'	140
Danger of pressing logic to extremes	141
Our ignorance of the conditions of Christ's existence in the unseen world	143
Equal difficulties surrounding the belief in a 'Presence of Virtue and Efficacy' and in a 'Supra-local Presence'	143
The writer inclined to the theory of Sacrifice which regards the Church on earth as uniting with her Lord in heaven	143
Eucharistic adoration properly a prelude to reception of Com- munion	145
Scripture again teaches a distinction between different modes of our Lord's Presence	145
Bishop Forbes passes from the Sacrifice of the Cross to the Sacrifice of the Upper Room without perceiving the difference between them	146

CHAPTER V

FIRST PART OF RESIDENCE AT PERTH. REUNION WORK 1860-1867

'Making his hardest task his best delight.'
WM. WORDSWORTH, *Ecl. Sonnets*, ii. 16.

Resolution to hold a General Synod carried in 1859	149
Its constitution	149
Committee on Canons	150
Bishop Eden chosen Primus (1862) : his character	150
Meetings in 1862-63	151
Canon on Episcopal elections	151
Bishop of St. Andrews offers to resign	152
Work of the Synod	152
Continuation of reunion work	152
Revival in the Establishment	153
Dr. R. Lee, Principal Tulloch, Dr. N. Macleod, Dr. Bisset	153
Removal of clerical disabilities in 1864	155
Commemoration addresses by Bishop of St. Andrews, 1860, 1861, 1862	156
Charges of 1863, 1864	157
Dr. Caird and Dr. Pirie	157
Dr. Rorison's attempt at a Reunion Conference	158

	PAGE
Synodal Address in 1866	158
Chichester Sermon (Euodias and Syntyche) 1867	159
Correspondence with Tulloch. 'A Plea for Justice'	160
Parallel attempts to use opportunities of educational changes	160
Advantages of Scotland as to elementary education	161
Acts of 1496 and of 1696	161
Act of 1861. The 'Shorter Catechism'	163
Attempt at a 'Common Catechism:' not published	164
A 'National Catechism,' 1864	165
Changes of 1872	166
Call for united action in this matter	167
The Bishop's 'Greek Grammar' adopted by the head-masters of England (1866)	167
'Shakespeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible' and 'Tercen- tenary Sermon,' 1864	168
Their value	169
Projected 'Shakespeare for the Young'	170
Three volumes of 'Historical Plays' (1883)	170
Other Shakespearian lectures (in 8vo. vol. C. W. iv.) published in 1885 in 'Scottish Church Review'	170, 382
Foundation of School Chapel at Perth (1866)	170
Letter to 'a candid doubter' (August 1866)	171
Foundation of Keble College	172
Reminiscences of Keble	172
Closer intercourse with England useful in itself, but not wholly favourable to the Reunion Movement	173
Archbishop Longley at Inverness (1866)	173
Charles Wordsworth at Rochester	174
Consecration of Bishop Claughton (June 1867)	174
At Lambeth Conference (September 1867)	175
His position in it between Archbishop Tait and Bishop Gray	176
At Chichester (November 1867)	178
Dr. Hook's letter	178
Reunion work dropped for fifteen years	179
Conditions of progress in such matters	179
Domestic events	180
Death of Kenneth Wordsworth (1862)	180
Death of Warden Barter (1861)	181
His character	181
Bishop Hamilton's generosity (1866)	183
Hamilton's affectionateness	185

CHAPTER VI

LAST YEARS AT PERTH

1868-1876

‘Through evil report and through good report.’

‘The gracious Providence of Almighty God hath I trust put these thorns of contradiction in our sides, lest that should steal upon the Church in a slumber, which now I doubt not but through His assistance may be turned away from us, binding ourselves thereto with constancy; constancy in labour to do all men good, constancy in prayer to God for all men.’—R. HOOKER, last page of Dedication of Book v. of his Treatise *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*.

	PAGE
Proposal to consecrate Bishop Macrorie in Scotland	186
Proposal to revive Archiepiscopal titles	189
Irish disestablishment	190
Letter from Bishop Claughton.	191
Biography in ‘Scotchchronicon’	191
Important conference of Clergy and Laity at Perth (1868)	192
Its Influence on Episcopal Synod (1869)	193
Correspondence with R. Palmer on Establishment	194
Christopher Wordsworth becomes Bishop of Lincoln	196
Bishop Hamilton’s death (1869). Depressing period	197
Troubles among the Bishops	197
Renewed disputes at S. Ninian’s. Mr. Burton Provost (1871-1885)	198
Perth Nunnery. Ritual Charge of 1872	199
Letter from Bishop Williams of Connecticut	200
Precentor Humble’s presentment: dismissed by the Bishops	200
Special Synod of 1873	201
Proposed Committee	201
Address by Dean and other Clergy	202
Various circulars	202
The Bishop gives notice of intended resignation (1874)	203
Resignation suspended.	204
Attempts at a <i>modus vivendi</i> with Provost Burton	204
Its partial success (1874-75)	204
Precentor Humble’s death (February 1876)	206
The Bishop’s character of him	207
Move to St. Andrews (October 1876)	207
Deaths of Bishops Ewing (1873) and Forbes (1875)	207
Of Rev. W. G. Shaw of Forfar (1874)	208
General Synod of 1876. Glenalmond Students. Cumbræ	208
Sermons in England, especially in English cathedrals	210
Visit to Gladstone (1876)	210
Work of New Testament Revision (1870-1881)	211
‘Final Suggestions’ on the four Gospels	212
Dr. Field’s ‘Otium Norvicense’	212

	PAGE
Secondary advantages of the Revision	213
Letter from Dean Blakesley	214
Charge of 1881	214
Letter of Archdeacon Palmer	215
The writer's judgment	215
Important book on 'Outlines of Christian Ministry' (1872)	216
Its value	217
Supplemented by 'Remarks on Dr. Lightfoot's Essay' (1879)	218
Stanley's Sermon on 'the Burning Bush'	218
Letter from Bishop Williams of Connecticut	218
Note on 'Sacerdotalism'	219

CHAPTER VII

RESIDENCE AT ST. ANDREWS AND LAST EFFORTS AT REUNION
1876-1892

'He who would win the name of truly great
Must understand his own age and the next,
And make the present ready to fulfil
Its prophecy, and with the future merge
Gently and peacefully, as wave with wave.'

From J. R. LOWELL, A Glance behind the Curtain.

Reasons for the Bishop's removal to St. Andrews	221
Influence on him of the learned society there	222
Retrospect. The 'Church Service Society,' founded in 1867	223
Its influence on Presbyterian worship	223
The Bishop renews his efforts	224
Sermon at the consecration of Edinburgh Cathedral (1879)	224
Review of Lord Bute's 'Breviary'	225
Correspondence with Dr. Milligan (1880)	225
Duke of Argyll on origin of Episcopacy	227
The 'St. Giles' Lectures' (1880-81)	228
His criticism in 'Discourse on Scottish Church History'	228
Its character	228
Letter from 'A Son of Toil'	229
Summary of the Bishop's views on Church polity	230
'Prospects of Reconciliation' (1882) drawn out by Milligan's conduct as Moderator	231
Dr. Sprott's theory of 'Two Orders'	232
How far supported	232
Presentation of Portrait painted by Mr. H. T. Munns	233
Invitations to preach in College Church and Parish Church, St. Andrews, accepted (1884)	234
Letter to Dean Johnston	234
Archbishop Benson's general sympathy with his efforts	235

	PAGE
Description of a University sermon at St. Andrews by the poet Robert F. Murray	236
Important article on ' Union or Separation ' (May 1884)	237
Its influence on the position of the Bishop at the Seabury Commemoration	238
Address prepared by him for that event	239
Article on ' Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism ' (January 1885)	240
Death of Bishop Christopher Wordsworth (March 1885)	240
Relation of the brothers	241
' The Case of Non-Episcopal Ordination fairly considered ' (3 September, 1885)	241
' Public Appeals ' (2 vols.) published 1886	242
Suggestion that Presbyterian Orders, though irregular, may be valid	242
Address at Aberdeen University (February 1886)	245
Invitation to lecture at St. Cuthbert's, Edinburgh	245
Changes in the Episcopate	246
Bishop Dowden consecrated and Bishop Jermyn elected Primus (21 September, 1886)	246
Charge on Book of Common Prayer. Jenny Geddes	246
Bishop Dowden, with his Chapter, objects to St. Cuthbert's lecture ' The Yoke of Christ to be borne in Youth ' published (1887)	247
Letters from Presbyterians and others	248
Dr. Cunningham's ' Lee Lecture ' discouraging	249
Other publications	250
' Jubilee Tract '	250
' Question of a Metropolitan '	251
Move to his last home, Kilrymont	252
Letter to Archbishop Benson on ' Ecclesiastical Union between England and Scotland '	253
Case of the Donatists	254
Wide proposals of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference (July 1888)	257
The Report re-committed	259
Charge of August 1888 on Lambeth Conference	259
Invitation to preach before University of Edinburgh, ' A Three-fold Rule of Christian Duty '	259
The author's own judgment	260
Discussion of Principle, Precedent and Expediency	260
These indicate weak points in the Bishop's scheme	262
Further opinion reserved	263
Obvious points emphasised	264
Duty of co-operation in practical work	264
Altered relation to St. Ninian's	264
Healthy influence of ' Supernumeraries,' Revs. S. B. Hodgson and G. T. Farquhar	264

	PAGE
Bishop uses Cathedral again (1882) and onwards	265
Death of Provost Burton and appointment of Provost V. L. Rorison. Lord Glasgow's failure: a blessing in disguise	265
New life of Cathedral (1886-1890)	265
Consecration of nave (7 August, 1890)	266
Verses to G. T. Farquhar	267
Family bereavements	267
General Synod (1890). Cordial relations with his colleagues	268
The Provost made Dean and Rev. A. S. Aglen Archdeacon	268
Charge describing work of General Synod (1890)	269
Jubilee of Trinity College, Glenalmond (1891)	271
Charge 'On Old Testament Criticism' (1891)	271
Analogy from reaction against Wolfian theory of Homeric poems	272
Present of a chair and pastoral staff (April 1892)	273
Continued literary activity	274
Last Charge read by Dean (October 1892)	275
Untoward incident	276
Final words on Reunion. Foundation of 'Scottish Church Society'	277
Last illness and death (5 December, 1892)	278
Burial in Cathedral Yard and Epitaph	279
Summary of the Bishop's public services by Dr. Danson and Canon Farquhar	280
His supposed egotism	282
His belief in the reality of the movement among leading Presbyterians	283
Testimony of Dr. James Cooper	284

CHAPTER VIII

EVENING OF LIFE, PARTICULARLY AT ST. ANDREWS

1876-1892

'Inveni portum! Spes et Fortuna valete!

Sat me lusistis: ludite nunc alios.'

'Immo alii inveniant ego quem, Christo auspice, portum,

Spes ubi non fallax, Forsque perennis adest.'

1. *Latin verses: partnership with Dean Stanley*

Motto of this chapter: its history	287
Stanley's version of these and other lines by Charles Wordsworth	287
Lines addressed to Dean Ramsay (1872)	289
Lines to Lord Beaconsfield on his return from Berlin Congress (1878)	291
His acknowledgment	295
'Beaumont and Fletcher'	295
Stanley's valediction	296

2. *Latin verses connected principally with St. Andrews*

<i>Sophocles loquitur</i>	297
Prof. Lewis Campbell's reply	298
Lines on Campbell's recovery from bronchitis	298
Lines to the 'Country Parson'	299
Elegy on Principal Tulloch (1886)	300
Intercourse with Principal Shairp and Prof. Knight	301
St. Leonard's Girls' School	302
Agnata Ramsay's success (1887)	302
The 'Scarlet Gown' (1878)	303
Dr. Macgregor's salmon	305
Dean Johnston's 'Wide-awake'	305

3. *The Wykehamist Dinner of 1880 and Athletics*

Speeches at Wykehamist dinner	306
First game of golf (1890)	310
'Pindar and Athletics, Ancient and Modern' (1888)	310
Letter on skating	311
The 'Flying Mercury'	312

4. *Revival or continuation of old friendships—Literary correspondence*

Cardinal Manning	312
Merivale's anecdote	313
Cardinal Newman	314
The Bishop's judgment of him	314
Opinion on Archbishop Trench	315
Letters to Dean Boyle	316
On Baxter	316
On Clarendon	316
On Hooker, Plea for Justice, &c.	317
Extract from Canon Farquhar's Diary: The Bishop's orderliness	318
The two Skinners	318
Letter to Dean Merivale: lines from Statius	319
The Bishop's version and the Dean's	320
Mr. Tuckwell's 'Tongues in Trees'	322
Mr. Gladstone: note to Sir J. E. Eardley-Wilmot	323
Intercourse with Bishop Claughton	324
Bishop Moberly's golden wedding	325
Interest in his nephews' writings	326

5. *Last publications in verse and prose executed and projected*

Latin poem on 'Nightmare'	327
'Series Collectarum,' &c.	330

	PAGE
Other hymns	331
'Lead, kindly Light'	332
Sonnet by Bishop of Ripon after visit to St. Andrews	333
Volumes of Sermons, Lectures, and Reviews, projected	334

6. *Manner of Preaching and Confirming*

Impressiveness of his sermons	335
Dr. Danson's criticism	335
Canon Farquhar's 'Funeral Sermon'	336
Always uses manuscript	336
Manner of confirming	336
Order of service. Cards	337

7. *Lord Selborne's Character of Bishop Wordsworth* . 338

The Bishop's remarks upon the book and the character	338
--	-----

8. *Conclusion* 342

APPENDICES 343-388

I. On Bishop Torry's Prayer Book	345
II. Pastoral Letter issued by the Episcopal Synod (27 May 1858)	349
III. Suggested Addition to Church Catechism :	
(A) Introductory Remarks (1878)	353
(B) Confirmation Card and Addition	357
IV. Remarks on the Archbishop's Judgment (1890)	360
V. The Waverley Novels arranged Chronologically	362
VI. The Lambeth Conference of 1888 and Home Reunion. Letter from Bishop Barry	363
VII. List of the principal Printed Writings of Charles Wordsworth in Chronological Order	366
VIII. Churches and Parsonages built during his Episcopate	386
IX. The Bishop's Family	388
INDEX	391

ILLUSTRATIONS

- PORTRAIT. *Painted by H. T. MUNNS* *Frontispiece*
PORTRAIT, in later life. *From a photograph* *to face p. 286*
-

NOTE ON THE PORTRAITS

The frontispiece is a reproduction of the portrait by Mr. H. T. Munns, painted in 1882 (see p. 233), leave to copy which has been kindly given by his son, Mr. H. E. Munns, of West-End Chambers, Birmingham. The other is from a photograph taken in 1889, in the possession of the Bishop's son, Mr. W. B. Wordsworth.

THE EPISCOPATE

OF

CHARLES WORDSWORTH

CHAPTER I

EARLY LIFE—ELECTION TO THE SEE OF ST. ANDREWS

‘Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might.’

Summary of early life, 1806–1853—Harrow, Oxford, Winchester, Glensalmond—Election as Bishop—Peculiar circumstances—Nature of the opposition—His claims on Churchmen—His criticism of Bishop Torry’s Prayer Book and views on Establishment—The Prayer Book described—Charles Wordsworth’s action respecting it—Establishment ‘an article of the Christian Faith’—Criticism on Mr. Gladstone—Strong feeling forty years ago—His character enables him to bear opposition.

CHARLES WORDSWORTH, second¹ son of Christopher Wordsworth, sometime Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Priscilla (Lloyd) his wife, was born 22 August, 1806, the day on which, as it happens, eighty-eight years later, I begin writing this memoir. He was baptised at Lambeth Palace 19 February,² 1807—nearly six months after his birth—the

¹ His elder brother John, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, was a laborious and most accomplished scholar, and a very amiable man, who died young, 31 December, 1839. His younger brother Christopher, Fellow of the same College, Head Master of Harrow School, Canon of Westminster, and finally Bishop of Lincoln, died 21 March, 1835. Both were educated at Winchester College as Commoners.

² The day, as he afterwards noticed, on which his first grandson was born in 1880.

Archbishop, Charles Manners Sutton, and William Wordsworth, the poet, being his sponsors. He was educated at Harrow School, where he went first in 1820, and at Christ Church, Oxford, which he entered in 1825. His early years, though chequered with occasional clouds of ill-health and fits of nervousness, to which he was liable all his life, were bright and successful. He was brilliant as a scholar, and in writing Greek and Latin verse he became a poet. Latin verse composition especially was his peculiar delight and solace to the end of his long life. He was distinguished in almost all manly exercises, particularly cricket, rowing, tennis, and skating. Tall, handsome, and athletic, with a strong and prepossessing countenance, set off by brown curly hair and brightened by a winning smile—to which the engraving of G. Richmond's portrait does some, but not sufficient justice—he seemed destined for great achievements. After taking his degree (1830) he acted for a time as a private tutor at Oxford, numbering among his pupils a remarkable band of eminent men, of whom Mr. W. E. Gladstone, Cardinal Manning, Bishop W. K. Hamilton, and Lord Canning will probably be considered by posterity as the most eminent. After some interesting and somewhat enterprising travels in Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Germany, in 1833-4, he came back to England engaged to be married to a lady whom he had met at Paris—Miss Charlotte Day, eldest daughter of the Rev. George Day, rector of Earsham, near Bungay. On his return to Oxford he was appointed to a public tutorship at the College by Dean Gaisford, and on 21 December, 1834, he was ordained Deacon by Bishop Bagot, of Oxford.

In the summer that followed he became Second Master of Winchester College, a position which enabled him to marry (29 December, 1835). This office not only afforded him an opportunity of teaching such as he was specially

qualified to embrace, but it gave him an equally important experience of management, since it involved the internal control of the ancient College and its seventy scholars, to which and to whom his heart became closely knit. Besides the intimate friendship of the much-loved and noble-hearted Warden, R. S. Barter, it brought him into daily and familiar relations with Dr. George Moberly, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, whose mind (as I can testify from my own experience) was specially fitted to strengthen and clarify the Church principles and to sharpen the intelligence of all with whom he came into close contact.

He held the office of Second Master for about eleven years, until March 1846. His marriage was a very happy one, but Mrs. Wordsworth died, to his extreme grief, on Ascension Day, 10 May, 1839, after giving birth to a daughter, the only child of their union. In the following year, at the Advent Ordination (13 December 1840), he was ordained Priest by the Bishop of Winchester—a delay of six years after his diaconate, such as would have seemed somewhat remarkable in this generation,¹ especially in one who conceived his duties as Master as involving so much of pastoral responsibility.² He had left Oxford before the 'Movement' was in full force, but he was, no doubt, considerably influenced by it, and for a time he appeared, at least to others, to be likely to throw in his lot with it.³ Certainly, in his relations to his boys, he seemed to a great

¹ It may be remarked that Dr. Arnold was not ordained Priest till 1828, having been ordained Deacon in 1818.

² The two volumes of *Christian Boyhood at a Public School*, published in 1846 and dedicated to Dr. Moberly, may be mentioned as giving a valuable record of this relation. His sermon on *Evangelical Repentance*, with its *Appendix* (Oxford, 1841 and 1842), is important in reference to the question of Penitential Discipline in the Church of England.

³ He has discussed his relation to the Oxford Movement at some length in the first volume of the *Annals*, 322–326. It contains, amongst other interesting matter, an affectionate estimate of his debt to his father—the Master of Trinity.

extent inspired by its motives and imbued with its methods.¹ His work as a teacher was probably the most congenial of all the employments in which he was at any time engaged, and his influence on his pupils, and on the general conduct of public school education, was remarkable. It would be difficult to produce a better testimony to this effect than is contained in the following words of the Bishop of Southwell (Dr. George Ridding), who was himself in after years one of the most influential teachers of Winchester College, both as Second and as Head Master. He writes thus on 6 December, 1892, just after the Bishop's death: 'Personally, I look upon him as the man who did me the most real and effective good of all who have helped me, and I hardly know at which time I felt the value of his influence in the College most, when I left Winchester or when I returned to it.'

In the winter of 1845-6 he determined to give up his work at Winchester, which he found too exhausting, and he was glad to be able to attend his father during his last illness. The latter had retired from the Mastership of Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1841, and died at his rectory of Buxted, 2 February, 1846. In the spring of the same year, shortly after he had completed his resignation of the Second Mastership, but was residing still at Winchester in a private house, Charles Wordsworth received a special visit from Mr. W. E. Gladstone, which altered the whole current of his after life. The object of this visit was to persuade him to undertake the Wardenship of Trinity College, Glenalmond, in Perthshire, which was then in building as a public school for the sons of Churchmen in Scotland, and as a training college for theological students. This offer he accepted, and on 28 October of the same year he entered on a second marriage, with Miss Katharine Mary

¹ I may mention the evidence on this point of the present Bishop of Truro (Right Rev. John Gott, D.D.), who was one of his pupils.

Barter, eldest daughter of the Rector of Burghclere, Hants, and niece of his great friend, Warden Barter. A few months were spent by the newly-married pair in Italian travel, and it was not till 4 May, 1847, that the new College was opened. The College Chapel, to the building of which he was himself the chief contributor, was consecrated 1 May, 1851, by the Primus, Bishop Skinner, with the assistance of three other Bishops, and in the presence of Mr. Gladstone.

From May 1847 to July 1854 Charles Wordsworth continued to be Warden of Trinity College, although he had been elected Bishop on 30 November, 1852, in succession to the aged Bishop Torry, and was consecrated to that office at St. Andrews Church, Aberdeen, on St. Paul's Day, 25 January, 1853. There was indeed no sufficient reason why he should not have continued to hold the two offices of Warden and Bishop, and to discharge their duties together. The union of the two offices (as Dean Torry has stated) was contemplated in the original project of the College,¹ and the Council of Glenalmond, after Bishop Torry's death, unanimously resolved that the two were not incompatible.² The number of charges and clergy in the Diocese was, and continues to be, very small, though it was doubled during Charles Wordsworth's episcopate. In very many ways it would have been advantageous to the Church if he had retained the Wardenship (of course with such extra help in teaching as might have been required), particularly as long as the theological students continued to reside at Glenalmond, whose education he considered to be a specially appropriate duty for a Bishop. But a combination of circumstances, which he has himself described,³ led to his

¹ See *Annals*, ii. 131.

² Letter from Chas. Wordsworth to his brother, dated 12 October [1852].

³ *Annals*, ii. 168-183.

resignation in 1854, the chief being the unsatisfactory financial condition of the College.

The circumstances of his election, which are somewhat fully described and discussed by himself in the 'Annals,' cannot wholly be passed over here, as they had naturally a certain influence on his after life and relations with some of the clergy of the Diocese, and with others. These circumstances involved his taking a part in the election himself, and giving a vote which decided the choice of the presbyterate. Unfortunately, in those days the laity had no voice in elections of Bishops, and a bare majority of the clergy present—a very small body in this case—was all that was required by the Canons. The two parties were exactly divided, apart from the Warden of Trinity College, eight against eight, and he was persuaded,¹ after much hesitation, to do as he had good precedents for doing, and as he was conscientiously convinced it was right in this case to do, to give his vote for himself and to subscribe the document certifying the election to the Primus. The election was, it so happened, twice repeated, the first having been declared null and void by reason of the absence of this proper form of return. His opponent on the first occasion was the Bishop of Moray (Eden), who withdrew when the election was cancelled, not wishing to oppose the Warden of Glenalmond. On the second the choice lay between himself and the Rev. T. G. Suther, D.C.L., then the popular Incumbent of St. George's, Edinburgh, and shortly after elected Bishop of Aberdeen.² The votes were as follows :

¹ I understand that Messrs. Lyon and Farquhar were specially strong in their persuasion.

² Dr. Suther became Bishop of Aberdeen in 1857. His name is unfortunately misprinted Luther in *Annals*, ii. 130, and on the next page, note 3, 'Lord Thedwyn' should of course be 'Lord Medwyn.' Besides the *Annals* I have had the use of the *Minute Book* of the Synod, through the kindness

For the Rev. C. Wordsworth.

For the Rev. Dr. Suther.

Messrs. Blatch.

Messrs. Burton.

Wood.

Douglas.

Wordsworth.

Forbes.

Bruce.

Chambers.

Malcolm.

Walker.

Johnston.

Lendrum.

Farquhar.

Macmillan.

Lyon.

Milne.

Torry.

It will be observed that the name of the Dean of the Cathedral (E. B. K. Fortescue) does not appear on either side. He was present and claimed a right to vote as an inducted clergyman; but though this fact is entered on the minutes, his name is not in the 'sederunt,' and he did not put his claim into force.¹ It is also to be noticed that before the voting the other party proposed that the election might be rendered unanimous if Mr. Wordsworth would promise to resign the Wardenship, but this he refused to accept as a condition, though willing to do it if hereafter he found the two offices incompatible.²

of the Synod Clerk, Rev. J. W. Hunter, of Birnam. It is, however, not complete. It contains, e.g., the protest against the election, but not the finding of the Episcopal College of 6 January, 1853, for which see *Annals*, ii. 136-7.

¹ No doubt it would at once have been challenged if he had done so, as is evident from the protest made by the Synod Clerk at the meeting of the Synod, 18 June, 1851, when Bishop Torry's Prayer Book was discussed. See *Minute Book*, p. 153 foll. Dean Fortescue withdrew his claim to a vote at the next meeting of the Synod, 16 June, 1852, until the position of St. Ninian's 'be determined by a General Synod' (*ib.* p. 162). He had, therefore, by his own act, no *locus standi* in 1853.

² See *Annals*, ii. 130. This is thus referred to in the *Minute Book* p. 182:—'Mr. Lendrum proposed that three on each side should adjourn to the Vestry, and there hold a brief conference in order that an election should, if possible, be rendered unanimous. The conference, though most amiable, was unsuccessful.' A second adjournment followed after another

His own full account of the circumstances ('Annals,' ii. 124-137) places them in a very clear light, and not a shadow of blame rests upon him. But none the less such an entrance into office was not happy for his personal relations in the future to some of those who were at the time his opponents. It is, however, satisfactory to notice that some ten years later, when a General Synod dealt with the question of Episcopal elections, in its revision of Canon III., and introduced a clause which seemed to himself to weaken his position, and gave him some little disquietude, all who still remained of those who at first opposed his election joined in the petition desiring him not to sever the tie between them by resignation.¹ This revision of the Canons, while it forbade a clerical elector to vote for himself, joined with the clergy a body of representative lay electors, and required that the Bishop chosen should have a majority of both orders.

Difficulties such as that to which reference has been made are, indeed, part of the price which has to be paid for a Church constitution in which the Episcopal office is purely elective, especially when it is in the hands of a very small body. They are, moreover, to be expected in a country where free expression of opinion on religious subjects and a critical attitude towards the opinions of others are parts of the daily atmosphere of life. But the period

discussion, but with the same result as the former. A motion for delay was also lost by a minority of one.

¹ See his *Letter to Dean Torry* dated Perth, 19 February, 1863, in reply to an address signed by seventeen out of twenty-three clergy, to which number two other incumbents joined themselves in even more forcible language. The Primus at the same time, in the name of the Bishops, disclaimed implying any censure upon him in the smallest degree, though acknowledging that his case had raised the question. This letter was printed at the *Perthshire Journal* office, but not published. The address was, of course, not signed by Rev. J. C. Chambers, the Incumbent of the Cathedral in 1852, who had resigned shortly after the election, and so ceased to belong to the diocese. So also had Mr. Lendrum.

was one of special tension in regard to ritual and doctrine, particularly, perhaps, in the Diocese of St. Andrews. To one outside the Diocese it might, indeed, have seemed strange at the time that so orthodox a Churchman and so eminent a man as Charles Wordsworth should have met with any opposition. The Diocese had very few charges, and was ill-provided in every respect, except in the possession of Trinity College, and so able a man could hardly have been expected to undertake its government. He was as high a Churchman as Bishop Eden, and higher than Mr. Suther. Not only was he an advocate for the daily service and the use of music—the whole school, in fact, acting as a surpliced choir—but he was known to be sound in his opinions on the doctrine of the Sacraments, then debated with especial keenness. His resolution in respect to the Gorham Controversy on Baptism, and to the judgment which at the time so shook the Church of England, was adopted unanimously by the special Synod of the Diocese held in 1850.¹ In regard to Holy Communion, he was at that time, and for a number of years afterwards, a supporter of the Scottish Office, which, as Warden of Glenalmond, he was pledged to use alternately with the English, and he had adopted the Eastward Position at the consecration prayer.²

His doctrine on the subject of the Holy Eucharist was delivered in the autumn of 1851 to the students and pupils

¹ See *Annals*, ii. 83, where it is given in full. It was held at Perth on 10 April.

² This he states himself generally in his *Charge* of 1859, pp. 21 foll. 'You will have noticed heretofore that in the celebration of the Holy Communion I have been in the habit of saying the consecration prayer with my face towards the East.' More will be said of this later. Cf. G. T. S. Farquhar, *Episcopal History of Perth*, p. 344 (Perth, J. H. Jackson, 1894), who does not, however, notice that the Bishop took the Eastward Position at St. Ninian's for the earlier part also of the service for the sake of conciliation.

of the College in 'Three Short Sermons,' in which he set forth its character as *a Sacrifice, Sacrament, and Eucharist*, in terms which might content most Churchmen of the present day. In these sermons he allied himself in general terms to the school which seems on the whole best to represent the peculiar attitude of Anglican theology towards this great mystery—namely, that which sees in the service on earth a representation of the service actually offered by our Great High Priest in heaven.¹ More will be said on these important sermons in Chapter III.

Why was it then that he was opposed? Some no doubt objected to the union of the offices of Warden and Bishop; but the main opposition to him came from the 'Cathedral Party,' who sheltered themselves under the authority of the aged Bishop Torry, and resented his stern censure of the peculiar edition of the Prayer Book which was, as it were, the symbol of their cause. His views on Church Establishment, and his strenuous defence of the principle as an article of faith, also contributed to the opinion formed of him. A few words are necessary, especially in regard to the Prayer Book, in order to account for the influence of this question on his election, in addition to what he has himself written upon it.

Bishop Torry in 1847, being then about 84 years of age, received a request signed by seven clergy of the Diocese—consisting of his son, John Torry, the Dean, and Revs. John Macmillan,² Alexander Lendrum,² Thomas Walker,² J. Charles Chambers² and Thomas Wildman,

¹ These sermons were printed when he was at Muthill. The preface is dated *Epiphany* 1855. The references to the heavenly sacrifice may be found on p. 10 (where he quotes the well-known passage from St. Ambrose *de Officiis Ministrorum*, i. 48), and on pp. 34, 35—the latter is a passage of considerable force and beauty.

² It will be observed that these four afterwards voted against Charles Wordsworth's election as Bishop.

Priests, and Rev. Wm. Palmer, Deacon—stating that they were ‘deeply sensible of the importance of having the Liturgy and usages of the Church of Scotland, for the last century, attested by a Prelate of his age and experience, and begging to express their desire that such a book might be edited under his sanction as shall serve as a document of reference and authority in regard to the practice of our Church.’¹ To this request he returned a favourable answer.

The book was edited by certain Presbyters of the Diocese, of whom, I believe, Messrs. George Forbes, brother of the Bishop of Brechin, and Alexander Lendrum were the principal, ‘every proof being forwarded to and revised by them.’ I have also heard that a Mr. Campbell, an Edinburgh advocate, had a hand in it. But when it appeared in April 1850 it was found to bear this title :

‘The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Use of the Church of Scotland: together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches; and the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.’ (Edinburgh: R. Lendrum & Co., Hanover Street, 1849.)

The next page bore the following certificate from the Bishop :

I hereby certify that I have carefully examined this edition of the Book of Common Prayer, and that it is in strict conformity with the Usage of the Church of Scotland; and I accordingly recommend it to the Use of the Clergy of my own Diocese.

PATRICK TORRY, D.D.,
Bishop of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane.

¹ I take these facts from J. M. Neale’s *Life and Times of Patrick Torry, D.D. Bishop of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane*. London, 1856, p. 273. The document in which they are found is a memorandum of Bishop Torry’s own dated St. Mark’s Day [25 April] 1848.

There was no hint that it was a composite production or that this was the first time that a Prayer Book with such a title had appeared in Scotland,¹ for Scotland up to the present day has not followed the example of the Church of the United States and of the Disestablished Church of Ireland, in having a Prayer Book of its own, but is content to use the English Prayer Book, with or without the Scottish Communion Office, which is sometimes bound up with it, but more often printed separately. Bishop Torry's Prayer Book had not been in any way before the Diocesan Synod, much less before the Episcopal College or the General Synod. It was, therefore, wholly unauthorised except by himself, and open to attack from many quarters and on many grounds.

The salient features of this book may be summed up as follows:—It presented the Church with a large addition to its Calendar. It sanctioned the sponsorship of parents in Baptism, and enjoined the sign of the Cross in Confirmation. It provided for reservation of the Sacrament for the sick. It emphasised examination of Communicants as to their faith, and absolution of notorious evil-livers. The mixed chalice was prescribed and permission was given to

¹ The only *similar* title is that called *The Booke of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other parts of Divine Service for the use of the Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1637, the service book which was so summarily rejected in the reign of Charles I. As to the title 'Church of Scotland' it was no doubt continued on the title-pages of many editions of the Scottish Communion Office as in that of Bishop Falconar, 1764. It was not apparently till about the beginning of the present century that the title 'Episcopal Church in Scotland' or 'Church in Scotland' came into use (see *Bibliography of the Scottish Office* in Bishop Dowden's *Annotated S. C. O.* pp. 276 foll. Edinburgh, 1884). Thomas Stephens's well-known book in four volumes is called, on the other hand, the *History of the Church of Scotland* (London, 1848), and many similar facts could be adduced. Nevertheless the official title of the Church as witnessed by the *Code of Canons* in its various revisions, 1838, 1863, 1876, 1890, is 'The Episcopal Church in Scotland.' The titles 'Scottish Episcopal Church' and now 'Scottish Church' are also used in similar documents.

celebrate with only one Communicant beside the Priest. On the other hand, there was no change in the rubric about the 'north side'—except the use of the word 'altar'—and for the first time, in any English Prayer Book known to me, appeared a rubric ordering the minister to dismiss non-communicants after the sermon.

It is easy to imagine the storm to which this publication at such a time gave rise, both in the Episcopal and Diocesan Synods, and in the public press. The Episcopal Synod seems to have lost no time in condemning the book, for it met on 17–19 April and desired the publishers to withdraw it from circulation—Bishop Forbes alone dissenting. The Diocesan Synod met at St. Andrews on 19 June and again at Perth on the 25th. On the former occasion it passed two resolutions on the proposal of Charles Wordsworth: the first concurring in the resolution which had been passed in April by the Episcopal Synod; the second 'recording its strong disapproval of the use of the book which has been so condemned, and also its determination, should the book be adopted or recommended by any clergyman of the Diocese, to institute Canonical proceedings against the offenders' ('Minute Book,' p. 142 foll.).

These resolutions were carried by a majority of eleven to five, the Dean, Torry—a son of the Bishop—and the Synod Clerk (Rev. G. G. Milne, of Cupar-Angus), voting in the majority, while Messrs. Lendrum, Chambers, and G. H. Forbes protested. These resolutions were sent to the Bishop of the Diocese asking his Episcopal sanction (*ib.* p. 148), as well as to the College of Bishops.

In view of the second resolution it was elicited in Synod that Messrs. Lendrum and Forbes used the book.¹ This

¹ Through the kindness of Miss Carrington, now living at Dunkeld or Birnam, I have a copy given to her by Mr. Lendrum, which was, I believe, for her use in the Cathedral.

was equivalent to threatening them with Canonical proceedings if they continued to do so. The book was also used in the Cathedral, and was in fact a sort of symbol of the 'Cathedral party.'

The Diocese of St. Andrews did not of course stand alone in condemning the book, but a similar censure was pronounced by the other Synods,¹ and the Episcopal College went still further in the controversy.

Mr. Wordsworth not only took this prominent part in the condemnation of the book in the Synod, but also wrote *seven letters* to the English 'Guardian' newspaper, which were occasioned by an inaccurate report of the Synod proceedings in that paper sent by Mr. Chambers, and afterwards reprinted them as a Pamphlet (Edinb. 1850). This and other actions on his part in the matter are recorded by himself.²

No doubt the Warden of Glenalmond was entirely in the right in the main issue, but it cannot be denied that he was over eager and anxious for completeness in what he did. Accuracy and orderliness were to him objects of almost a passionate devotion, carried into the details of daily life. It was too, unfortunately, impossible for him to be prominent in such a cause without seeming to act somewhat harshly towards his own Diocesan, an old man of eighty-five, and now afflicted with a painful disease. One cannot read the old Bishop's reply to the Synod³ with its sigh 'Eheu in quae reservasti me tempora!' without a feeling of sympathy, and a wish that it had been possible for his own Synod to have met him in a different manner. For I do not think it possible to accept the explanation

¹ See Neale's *Life of Torry*, p. 282 foll. Many documents are given there which are necessary to the full understanding of the matter.

² *Annals*, ii. 86.

³ Dated Peterhead, 17 August, 1850, and preserved in the *Minute Book*, p. 148. It was an echo of Archbishop Parker's note on his own consecration.

that the Bishop was led into rash action without knowing what he was about, though, doubtless, his judgment may have been weakened by old age.

No doubt Messrs. Forbes and Lendrum, and perhaps Mr. Chambers, had much to do with the form of the book, but the rubric ordering the dismissal of non-communicants is, I think, conclusive as to the Bishop's real responsibility for it; ¹ and certainly, in his controversy with the Episcopal College, Bishop Torry showed a vigour and a determination, in fact an obstinacy, which at once makes his own position in the matter clear, and shows how difficult a man he was to deal with. It also has to be borne in mind that for a long time he had not resided in the Diocese, but at Peterhead, north of Aberdeen, and had for a number of years ceased to attend the Diocesan Synods. He therefore could hardly expect to exercise the influence proper to a Bishop.

As regards the other matter which placed Mr. Wordsworth out of harmony with certain others in the Diocese—his defence of the principle of Establishment ² 'as an Article of the Christian Faith'—it is necessary to remember that even in England a shock had recently been given to that principle by the Gorham Judgment, and that High Churchmen in Scotland could not be expected to be ardent defenders of a principle which at once brought up the vexed question of their duty towards the Established Presbyterian Church in the midst of which they were living. Mr. Wordsworth not only defended the Establishment of Religion in England, but he defended it on a far-reaching principle deduced from Holy Scripture, as the intention of Christ for the welfare of His Church and people, whensoever and wheresoever circumstances reason-

¹ See Appendix I. *On Bishop Torry's Prayer-book.*

² Especially in the sermon, *National Christianity an Article of the Christian Faith*, published at the expense of his friend, T. L. Claughton, then Vicar of Kidderminster, where it was preached in 1851.

ably admitted of it. He afterwards (in 1868)¹ for a time attempted to draw a distinction between Establishment such as we have in England and that which exists in Scotland, in regard to which there is certainly much to be said; but he returned to his first broad view in later years, and those who felt he went too far in 1853 had divined what was the permanent bias of his mind.

Another element in the opposition to his election as Bishop was the influence of his old friend Mr. W. E. Gladstone, in whose principles Charles Wordsworth had ceased to feel confidence, and with his usual outspokenness took occasion to proclaim it. He could not do otherwise than give his reasons for not supporting him on the occasion of his first election for Oxford; but it was perhaps not very opportune to put forward his difference of opinion on a special occasion when Mr. Gladstone was present,² and, of course, personally deeply interested—namely, at the consecration of the Chapel of Trinity College, Glenalmond. He also published a ‘Letter to Mr. Gladstone on the Doctrines of Religious Liberty,’ in reply to his letter to Bishop W. Skinner, of Aberdeen (then Primus), ‘On the Functions of Laymen in the Church,’ in which he pointed out the inconsistency of his opinions there expressed with what he formerly held, and inferred that the principles there enunciated would probably one day, sooner or later, lead the writer to desire the separation of Church and State. This must have been his last publication before his election.

Taking all these things into consideration and

¹ See his *Address to the Conference of Clergy and Laity at Perth*, 1 October, 1868, p. 3, col. 2. This address was never printed in pamphlet form, but only extracted from the *Perthshire Journal*. It is in many ways valuable (see below, p. 26 and Chapter VI.).

² I do not see anything in the Fasque sermon preached in 1847 to which Mr. Gladstone could reasonably object. For the Glenalmond sermon see *Annals*, ii. 92, 93.

remembering that Mr. J. Charles Chambers was at that time Incumbent of the Cathedral, it is not surprising that the party who were representatives of the Tractarian Movement in England were anxious to prevent his election as Bishop. His own words on this subject, written towards the close of his life, may fitly be quoted¹ :

I was soon made to feel that no party spirit is more keen and bitter than that which is directed against those who sympathise to a great extent and approach near, but cannot allow themselves to go all lengths in a movement, which appears to them extreme and injudicious or ill-timed. Dr. Hook had experienced this at Leeds.

During the whole period of my Wardenship at Glenalmond I had to encounter much which would have been very trying and discouraging to a man of less sanguine and resolute disposition than I was ; and the discouragement for the most part came from quarters in which I had every right and reason to expect support. A few energetic men, of great zeal but little judgment or discretion, were impatient to push on the cause of our Church by ways which for many years proved a hindrance rather than a help, and do so still to some extent at the present time. They were men of advanced opinions, who looked for guidance to Pusey and Keble rather than their own Bishops.

He then goes on to remark on the opposition of the ' Guardian ' newspaper and the prejudice excited against himself when it was seen that he was determined to take an independent line.

There was certainly in those days a strength and an outspokenness of antagonism which was characteristic, not only of those who took part in the Oxford Movement, but of the religious newspapers on all sides, and even sometimes of graver writings and graver personages. This was partly owing to the fiery spirit of individuals, partly to the anxiety and unrest of the times, when secessions to Rome

¹ MS. i. 3 foll.

were actual, or imminent, or seemingly probable, not on the part, as now, generally of weaker men, but of some who were confessedly regarded as leaders. Still more was it due to the miscalculation of the forces necessary to check or crush the natural, and, in a degree, perfectly innocent and salutary, development of parties and opinions within the Church. Appeals to force, in the form of hostile votes in Oxford assemblies, or of legislation in Parliament, or of actions at law, were still considered natural, if not highly creditable, weapons. It is not perhaps safe to anticipate that they have entirely disappeared from use among us, but it is probable that they will never again be resorted to under similar circumstances with the same sanguine hopes, and put in operation by men of the same high position. It was then considered almost latitudinarian to love the comprehensiveness of the Church of England. Now, thank God! there are few, at least among the clergy, who do not understand in some degree why it is to be cherished.

In such days as these, however, Charles Wordsworth was called to be a Bishop. His life in this great office was not an easy one, and in many respects it was not a happy one. He had, however, many qualities which enabled him to make a better use of his opportunities, and to ride through the storms which he encountered with less loss than many a weaker man would have done. Though constitutionally nervous as regards things in prospect, he was yet, as he describes himself, 'sanguine and resolute.' He was determined to do whatever he did 'with his might,' and he threw himself eagerly into the study of any question that presented itself. He gave his full attention to it, and, as far as he was able, exhausted it, and thus satisfied himself that he had done his best to arrive at the truth, and to be able to deliver a fair judgment upon it. Having done his best, he did not dwell with morbid introspection on

the details of the past. When a thing was done he did not usually worry himself about it, or finely balance his own motives, or the share which he had with others in producing a particular result. He had a very genuine and healthy piety, an untroubled faith, and an unbroken confidence in the beliefs and convictions which he had partly inherited and partly embraced. Religious doubt, such as is now floating about us, was probably unknown to him. Nor does he ever seem to have experienced that attraction to the Roman position, much less to Roman ways and usages, which men as strong as himself have been known at certain moments to feel. His mind, though logical, well-trained and full, and with a great capacity for historical judgment, and aided by an admirable memory, was not readily engaged by questions which concern the philosophical side of religion, or eagerly occupied about its more mysterious aspects. He was naturally on the look out for sympathy, and keenly appreciated it from whatever quarter it came, and he was exceedingly anxious to be fair and moderate in his judgments, but he did not enter very easily and fully into the views and feelings of other thinkers. Occasionally, too, his perception of the folly or weakness of those with whom he was dealing was allowed to express itself too frankly in epigrammatic phrase or telling antithesis. He was then apt to take things too seriously, and to betray a certain lack of humour. This apparent severity gave a wrong impression of his character and accounted for some of the opposition which he met with, especially where he yielded to an almost youthful impetuosity. No doubt, too, his long experience as a schoolmaster intensified the critical instincts of his nature, and made him ready to express disapproval and to try to set things right, when a man more used to policy and to weigh consequences would have asked himself whether it was necessary to emphasise

and enlarge upon his disagreement in public. But generally, and more markedly as he mellowed with age, he took a large, serene and public view of things, believing that time and good sense would work men round to views which he supposed to have the strong balance of historical experience and reasonableness in their favour. A character and disposition of this kind, controlled by a clear and quiet conscience, enabled him to bear opposition, suffering, and disappointment, and to go on with hopefulness, where many a softer or more self-conscious man would have been thoroughly beaten and out of heart.

CHAPTER II

THE DIOCESE AND THE BISHOP

‘Manus ad clavum : oculus ad cœlum.’¹

The Diocese of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane—Character of Episcopacy in Scotland—Early history of the three Sees—Historical interest of the united Diocese and attractiveness of the district—Strong points of Presbyterian organisation and Scottish character—Its attraction to Bishop Wordsworth—General conception of his duty—Three principles adopted by him—His progress in the movement towards reunion.

THE united Diocese of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane is in more than one respect the most eminent in Scotland. Not only does it represent the primatial see and two others of great dignity, but it contains within its boundaries ‘the fairest portion of the Northern Kingdom.’

Before we consider its natural beauty and attractiveness a few words will not be out of place as to the historical interest attaching to the Diocese ; and I shall endeavour to consider it not merely as the sphere of labour to which the subject of this memoir was called, but also in connection with the great task to which he specially applied himself and the difficulties he experienced in it. In order to understand the circumstances of a Scottish Bishop’s life it is well always to remember the general outlines of the history of episcopacy in that country, which differ

¹ This motto, which is in English ‘The hand to helm : the eye to heaven,’ is regularly inserted in the Bishop’s almanacks from 1857 onwards up to 1874, sometimes with the addition of a sentence of Scripture. From 1875 onwards he wrote it, ‘Oculus ad cœlum : manus ad clavum,’ with a reference ‘see *Bishop Sanderson*, ii. 93.’ Sanderson writes it so. The words are on the grave at St. Andrews : see p. 280.

widely from those with which we are familiar in England. It has been asserted, and I believe with correctness, that the growth of the parochial system in Scotland was more rapid than it was in England.¹ The growth of Dioceses, on the other hand, was very much slower and less systematic, though this was not from want of an Episcopate. The members of the order of Bishops, as distinct from the Presbyterate, seem indeed usually, if not always, to have been sufficient for the wants of the people, and from time to time we have evidence that, even in early ages, they formed a numerous body. They had, as elsewhere, a dignity and a certain class of duties which were reserved to them alone. But they did not, as elsewhere, form centres of unity, or possess the authority of Diocesan Bishops with mutually exclusive jurisdictions. The centres of unity and authority were rather the Abbats or heads of monasteries, who might possibly be Bishops, but were generally, like their chief, the Abbat of Iona, only Presbyters.² In the latter case the Bishops were subordinate members of the corporation, or they might apparently be living unattached, possessed of Episcopal dignity, but with no settled jurisdiction.³

Whatever may have been the case in the south, where the successors of St. Ninian (*circa* A.D. 360–432) in Galloway may have obtained, at an early period, some kind of

¹ Sir John Connell, *On Tithes* (Edinb. 1815), i. p. 46, quoted by C. J. Lyon, *History of St. Andrews*, i. p. 44 (Edinb. 1843), a book in which I have found much that is valuable.

² See on this subject generally George Grub's *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, vol. i. chaps. x. 'The Ecclesiastical Government of Iona,' and xi. 'The Doctrine and Ritual of the Scottish Church during the Primacy of Iona.' Cp. e.g. p. 152: 'There was no Diocesan Episcopacy; properly speaking, no Episcopal rule at all. Each abbot was the head of his own monastery, and over all was the successor of St. Columba, the Primate of the Picts and the Scots.'

³ Even in later days the Bishop of the small Diocese of Brechin was a kind of appendage to the Abbey of Arbroath rather than an independent Prelate.

jurisdiction,¹ there appears to have been no attempt at Diocesan Episcopacy to the North of the Clyde and the Forth till a very much later date. It was not till the beginning of the tenth century that we find a Bishop residing at St. Andrews, emerging suddenly in alliance with the newly-risen power of the Kings of the Scots.

The notices of a Pictish primacy at Abernethy—about seven miles S.E. of Perth—are too shadowy to be more than just referred to in passing. For our present purpose it is enough to remember that about the middle of the ninth century Kenneth MacAlpine, King of the Scots, absorbed into his dominions the southern kingdom of the Picts and transferred the primacy of the Abbat of Iona to the Abbat of Dunkeld (A.D. 849). About fifty years later Constantine III. and Kellach the Bishop—possibly in consequence of a recent raid by the Normans on Dunkeld—entered into a solemn compact to observe the laws and discipline and rights of the Church. This act, which has been compared to the signing of Magna Charta in England, took place at Scone, near Perth, in the year 906, on a hill henceforth called ‘The Hill of Faith.’ This act was not improbably connected with the transference of the Primacy from Dunkeld to St. Andrews²—Kellach being the first Bishop

¹ Cp. the monuments of the ‘praecipui sacerdotes’ at Kirkmadrine in Wigtonshire. St. Mungo or Kentigern at Glasgow, the contemporary of St. Columba circa A.D. 600, appears to have had no definite successors. The first Bishop of Glasgow was John Achaius, A.D. 1115–47.

² The Rev. Rob. Keith (*Hist. Cat. of the Scottish Bishops down to 1688*: Edinb. 1824) gives seven different forms of the succession. The following entry (describing the circumstances referred to in the text) in the *Chronicon Pictorum*, No. 83 (printed in the *Appendix* to John Pinkerton’s *Enquiry into the History of Scotland preceding the Reign of Malcolm III.* [1056], vol. i. 493), is one of the landmarks of Scottish Ecclesiastical History: ‘Constantinus fil. Edii tenuit regnum xl annis. Cujus tertio anno Normanni praedaverunt Duncalden, omnemque Albaniam. In sequenti utique anno occisi sunt in Fraith heremi Normanni. Ac in vi. anno Constantinus rex, et Cellachus episcopus, leges, disciplinasque fidei atque jura ecclesiarum evangeliorumque, pariter cum Scottis, in Colle Credulitatis, prope regali civitate

named in connection with the latter place. From this point something like Diocesan Episcopacy begins in the North of Scotland. The Bishop living in St. Andrews received or assumed the title of 'Episcopus Scottorum' or 'Scotorum,' or 'Episcopus Primus (or Maximus) Scotorum,' keeping, however, his residence in the old Culdean Monastery of Kirkheugh, which was situate east of the Cathedral and overlooking the harbour. The first Bishop of St. Andrews who established himself in a separate dwelling was, characteristically enough, an Englishman, Roger, son of the Earl of Leicester, who built the castle at the end of the twelfth century (A.D. 1200). Yet it was not till towards the close of the thirteenth century that the definite title 'Bishop of St. Andrews' appears on the seal of William Fraser or Frazer¹ (1279-1297 A.D.). To the Bishop of this See was accorded by custom a kind of Primacy. Nevertheless, it was not for a century and three quarters after the death of Bishop Fraser that St. Andrews acquired the dignity of a metropolitan and archiepiscopal see. This was in the person of Patrick Graham, who in the year 1472 received the corresponding titles from Pope Sixtus IV.,² and thus ousted the much disputed metropolitanical claims of the Archbishop of York.³ It is

Scoan, devoverunt custodiri. Ab hoc die collis hoc meruit nomen i.e. Collis Credulitatis. Et in suo viii. anno cecidit excelsissimus rex Hybernensium, et archiepiscopus, apud Laignechos, i. Cormace filius Culenan,' etc. . . . 'et in senectute decrepitus [R. Constantinus] baculum cepit, et domino servivit: et regnum mandavit Mael filio Domnail.' According to Pinkerton, this chronicle was written about A.D. 1020.

¹ It was used, however, somewhat earlier in the attestation of Charters (see Dr. J. F. S. Gordon's *Scotichronicon*, i. 175, Glasgow, 1867). Roger (1188-1202), before his consecration, is described on his seal as 'Electus Sancti Andree,' *ib.* p. 145. Frazer, on one seal, is also 'Scottorum episcopus,' p. 174. It is noted that the Culdees were excluded for the first time from voting for Frazer's predecessor, Wm. Wishart, in 1273.

² Lyon's *St. Andrews*, i. 233; Grub, *E. H. S.* i. 376.

³ The southern part of Scotland was no doubt in the province of York, but an attempt was made to claim supremacy over the whole kingdom. In

very remarkable that Scotland was so long in arriving at this point of development, since as early as A.D. 816 the Anglo-Saxon Council of Celehyth had made it a reason amongst others for suspecting men in Scottish (which of course included Irish) orders 'that they acknowledge no metropolitans.'¹ But whilst Ireland had long accepted the authority of Armagh, Scotland had before and during the Church Revolution of the sixteenth century only a short and tragic succession of seven Archbishops of St. Andrews, two of whom were boys and two were murdered.²

The foundation of the second See of the United Diocese, that of Dunkeld, is referred to the reign of Alexander I. (A.D. 1124), the first Bishop being named Cormac, to whom, besides the present Diocese of Dunkeld (including Dunfermline), were probably also assigned the territories afterwards divided between the Bishops of Dunblane and Argyll. At the same time the Scottish provinces on the left bank of the Spey, to the north-west and north of Perthshire, were formed into the Bishopric of Murray.

The erection or restoration of Dunblane is attributed to David I., the son of Malcolm and St. Margaret, about A.D. 1150, when the number of Dioceses was further increased to its full extent, with the exception of Edinburgh, founded in the time of Charles I.

1126, just after the foundation of the Sees of Dunkeld and Murray, an effort was made at Rome to obtain the pallium for St. Andrews, but it was successfully opposed by Thurston, Archbishop of York (see Grub, *E. H. S.* i. p. 264).

¹ See Haddan and Stubbs' *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, iii. 581; cp. Wilkins' *Concilia*, i. 170. A similar canon was enacted at Chalons on the Saone in 813, but it went even further in declaring ordinations by Scottish Bishops to be null. See Labbe, *Concilia*, vii. 1821; Grub, *E. H. S.* i. 127-8.

² 1. William Schives or Shevez; 2. James Stewart (aged 21); 3. Alexander Stewart (a youth of 18-23 years, natural son of King James IV., who fell with his father at Flodden); 4. Andrew Forman; 5. James Beaton; 6. Cardinal David Beaton; and 7. John Hamilton. The two last were murdered.

Bishop Wordsworth felt the importance of his position in succeeding to so wide an inheritance, if not of power yet of tradition. It may not be out of place to quote here from an important address which he delivered some years later to the clergy and laity of the Diocese,¹ in which, after sketching the history of the three Dioceses to his own time, he passes to their present condition with some words of graceful appreciation of the most distinguished of his predecessors.

Before I proceed to take account of their present condition, I feel that, after a retrospect which has shown us much to deplore, it would be inexcusable if I failed to pay some tribute of respectful and grateful commemoration to those among my predecessors who have been most deservedly eminent—to Turgot in the See of St. Andrews (A.D. 1109–1115), the chaplain and, after her death, the biographer of the saintly Queen Margaret; to James Kennedy in the See first of Dunkeld and afterwards of St. Andrews (1436–1466), the munificent founder of St. Salvador's College, and in this and other respects the William of Wykeham of our Scottish Church; to Gavin Douglas in the See of Dunkeld (1516–1527), our Scottish Chaucer; to John Spottiswoode, Archbishop of St. Andrews² (1615–1639), who, having died in London, was honoured by burial in Westminster Abbey; to Robert Leighton, in the See of Dunblane (1661–1673), our Scottish Fénelon; to Thomas Rattray, in the See of Dunkeld (1727–1743), equally memorable for his theological attainments and for his services in securing to our Church, as disestablished, the basis of the pure Scriptural and Apostolical constitution which it now enjoys.³

The Diocese, as now consolidated, had not, indeed, very long been so large in extent as it is at present. The name

¹ At a Conference held at Perth, reprinted from the *Perthshire Journal and Constitutional* of Thursday, 1 October, 1868. See Chap. VI. below.

² The historian.

³ This refers to his securing the restoration of Diocesan Episcopacy against the system of 'College Bishops.' He was owner of Craig Hall, in a romantic situation, near Blairgowrie, in Perthshire.

of the See of St. Andrews had been for 140 years in abeyance, since the death of Archbishop Ross in June 1704 (when the primacy and metropolitanical jurisdiction of that See came to an end), until 1844. The nonjuring Bishops appear to have been afraid of trenching on the prerogatives of the Sovereign whom they acknowledged, which they supposed to include that of assigning jurisdiction to particular prelates. They had, in fact, tied their own hands by assent to the 'Assertory Act' of 1669, under which Archbishop Burnet was suspended, and Leighton (nominally at least) translated to Glasgow. At first they were so timid as to drop all Diocesan titles, but these, after an interval, were revived under Bishop Rattray's influence. It is not quite clear why they shrunk from the further step of reviving the Archbishopric, since the assignment of metropolitan jurisdiction is no more part of the prerogative than the distribution of Dioceses. But probably they were afraid of alarming their countrymen, to whom the traditions of Archbishops were worse even than those of simple prelacy. However this may have been, in the temporary arrangements then and thereafter made, the county of Fife was treated as a Diocese, with no special pre-eminence, sometimes being administered alone and sometimes in conjunction with other districts. It was not till September 1844 that it was determined, by an Episcopal Synod held at Edinburgh, that the ancient name should be restored, and from that date Bishop Torry took the title of Bishop of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane.¹

The Diocese thus constituted consists of the entire counties of Fife and Kinross, the whole of Perthshire except the Carse of Gowrie, Clackmannan (less Alloa), two parishes

¹ Grub, *E. H. S.* iv. 250. Cp. iii. 346 foll. Before that date he was for a time 'Bishop of Dunkeld, Dunblane, and Fife' (Neale's *Life of Torry*, p. 202).

of Stirlingshire, and a great part of Forfar. In naming this district 'the fairest portion of the Northern Kingdom' I am but accepting the judgment of Sir Walter Scott, who applies that title to the county of Perth,¹ a title which he supposes would be given to it by any intelligent stranger, while the natives of any other district of Scotland would acknowledge its merits at least as second to those of their own home. Bounded on the south by the River Forth, and containing the lovely lakes by which it and its tributary the Teith are fed, it embraces nearly the whole basin of two other rivers, the Earn and the Tay, which rise amidst the most beautiful mountains and descend through the most romantic glens and passes of the Highlands. In Perth it has a capital, close to the old royal residence of Scone, on so attractive and so obviously commodious a site at the head of the Firth of Tay, that its ancient history has been prolonged into the present ages by successful commerce, which has made it one of the most flourishing cities of Scotland. In St. Andrews, on the sweep of a great bay of the Fifeshire coast, it has a university city, with a tragic yet not wholly mournful past, relieved with much that is bright and dignified, and with a sunny, breezy, present charm of its own which almost everyone who knows the place has experienced. A similar interest and a similar beauty attach to the other traditional centres. The Tay, which is glorious at Perth, is more beautiful still in its narrower current higher up in the soft wooded valley, where it is spanned by Telford's bridge, and flows between the ancient city of Dunkeld and the modern village of Birnam. At Dunblane the Allan, famous in song, which drains the lowlands where Agricola fought and conquered Calgacus² and Mar, in 1715, disputed the

¹ *Fair Maid of Perth*, beginning of Chap. I.

² The camps at Ardoch, near Braco, a short distance from Greenloaning

ground evenly with Argyll,¹ passes quietly beneath the picturesque cliff on which the Cathedral stands, and where the saintly Leighton loved to walk. At each little city was a ruined cathedral, with some special grace and glory of its own, one of which, Dunblane, was gradually restored during Bishop Wordsworth's latter years in a manner which augurs well for the future progress of Church life in Scotland in the beauty of holiness.

At Abernethy, an old Pictish centre, stands one of the two round towers of Scotland, which a good authority supposes to have been erected as early as the reign of the third King Nectan (A.D. 712-727), and by the Northumbrian architects of the monastery of Jarrow,² and to be a remarkable link of connection with the golden age of the North-Anglian Church in the time of the Venerable Bede.

At Glamis, in the northern part of his Diocese, is a castle of unparalleled dignity and strangely fascinating traditions. At Forfar, hard by, is a centre of Church life, and of persistent ministry in the evil days of the last century, which has shown what the Episcopal Church may be to the people when led by devoted men.

At Dunfermline, on rising ground overlooking the Firth

Station, are the largest and most complete in Britain, and are supposed to be those used by Agricola A.D. 88. See Tacitus, *Agricola*, chap. 29 foll. I visited them 2 September, 1895. I find from his diary that my uncle visited them 11 August, 1876.

¹ At the battle of Sheriffmuir, though neither side gained the victory, Argyll prevented the Pretender's army from crossing the Forth.

² Dr. Petrie, quoted in Murray's *Handbook to Scotland*, p. 279, ed. 5, 1884. See also J. Russell Walker, *Pre-Reformation Churches in Fifeshire*, fol. Edinb. 1895, from which I gather that it was connected with a Church dedicated to St. Bridget. The other round tower in the Scottish mainland is at Brechin, and is considered to be several centuries later. It is connected with the Cathedral. Abernethy is sometimes called the Pictish capital, but that is said rather to have been at Forteviot. See Grub, *E. H. S.* i. 132 and 116 foll. who records the intercourse between Nectan and Ceolfrid and possibly Bede himself, from Bede, *H. E.* v. 21.

of Forth, the southern boundary of the Diocese, is a busy manufacturing city which contains some of the most interesting memorials of the royal families of Scotland. Here on a mound, surrounded by a deeply-cut defile, Malcolm Canmore built his modest tower, where he welcomed his sainted wife Margaret flying from the Norman Conqueror, and here they became parents of a line of kings. Here, too, in close proximity, they founded together the Benedictine Abbey, where they and their descendants, down to Robert the Bruce, lie buried. The solemn almost empty Norman nave, in style not unlike Durham, is nearly all that remains of the 'Westminster Abbey of Scotland,' but the great ruined front of the later palace, close to and connected with the abbey buildings, is intimately associated with the history of Queen Mary and her descendants the English Stewarts, and carries on our thoughts to times that closely affect our own.

At Kinross, which lies half-way between Dunfermline and Perth, is a bright little county town, with red-tiled roofs that might belong to Lincolnshire, lying on the western shore of the picturesque basin of Lochleven—the glory of that little county—guarded by the two Lomonds. The reader needs hardly to be reminded of the historic islands which rise from its surface, one, St. Serf's, carrying us back to the early times of the Culdees, the other, with its peel tower and rampart wall, the scene of one of the hard captivities, and of the romantic escape of the ill-fated Mary Stewart.

It would take too long to describe, even in few words, the castles, forts, and battlefields, the abbeys and churches and sacred shrines, of this fair district. Everywhere throughout these counties are scenes that delight those who look upon them, and raise images of love and pity in the reflecting mind. Everywhere are signs of old piety

disturbed by conflict, and suddenly arrested in its development, but ready to rise again; of old honour and glory, of baronial state and Highland chieftaincy, now bent down and ruined in civil warfare, now emerging from it with renewed bravery. Everywhere are signs of modern activity in religion, but of religion at variance with itself and eager to display its differences. Everywhere, and above all other sources of interest, is a strong and self-confident humanity, yet with a quaint charm, like that of the country itself, from its blending of Celtic and Lowland characteristics. Here you have enthusiastic devotion to a cause or a person, reckless of consequences, side by side with plain good sense of duty and respect for others. Here you will find tenderness and poetry mingled with roughness and bluntness, strange outspokenness and equally strange reserve, generosity and shrewdness of dealing, the expected and the unexpected, doors opened into the soul and suddenly shut—in fact all the marked characteristics of our composite British nature, more developed than in England, and, more often perhaps than with us, united in the same persons. To Bishop Wordsworth, who had come into such close contact with his uncle William, and was in many ways imbued with his spirit, the country which had inspired some of his most characteristic, that is to say, at once most spiritual and most human poems, could not but be full of an inexpressible charm. It had also a sort of family interest of another kind, from the exertions of the men whom the Wordsworths were specially brought up to honour, Bishop Horsley, William Stevens, and Joshua Watson, who were the particular friends and benefactors of the Scottish clergy.

No region could be fitter than this to evoke the desires of an earnest and persistent man in the fulness of life and power, anxious for the coming of the Kingdom of God. It

was, as he said to a friend¹ (towards the close of his long life), to our Lord's office as King that he looked with most earnestness for stay and comfort, in the midst of the controversies and divisions in which his lot was thrown. It would not be untrue to say that this was the guiding principle of his life. Such a country could not fail to stimulate him to vigorous action of some sort in the hope of contributing to the fulfilment of his Master's designs and prayers. Here was a strong people and a religious people all about him, separated as to its great bulk into three opposing Presbyterian communions, divided, as every Englishman feels, for no sufficient reasons, and yet divided by a hostility, or at any rate a rivalry, of a most practical kind. His own historic Church, which had the right, as he notes, to the territorial titles, at least as regards its Dioceses,² was but a fraction of the population (in his later

¹ Dr. J. Myers Danson (of Aberdeen), who quoted his words in his paper entitled 'Charles Wordsworth,' one of the lectures on *Scottish Church Worthies*, given in St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh, in 1895.

² This is his note, MS. i. 11: '*Our use of territorial titles.*—Some persons imagine that the use of territorial titles—of the ancient titles of their respective sees—is a usurpation on the part of the Scotch Bishops, and an intrusion into the privileges of the Established (Presbyterian) Church. But this is a mistake. When Lord John Russell brought in his Ecclesiastical Titles Bill it included the prohibition of these titles, but the clause was withdrawn and our titles were purposely left unprohibited; in other words, they were recognised and allowed by the Legislature. In my own case, when I was elected Fellow of Winchester [the new statutes made by the Governing Body and approved by her Majesty in Council, November 20, 1873, contained the following clause, under the title "Fellows," p. 4: "The Right Reverend Charles Wordsworth, Bishop of St. Andrews, shall enjoy as a Fellow of the College the same pecuniary interest, as well as the same status therein, as the Fellows elected before the passing of the 'Public Schools Act, 1854'."]'" I have completed this note by the words in brackets taken from a memorandum on a loose paper. My uncle has not, perhaps, stated his case quite as strongly as he might have done, for not only are the titles 'left unprohibited,' but section 3 of the 'Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Act (14 & 15 Vict. c. 60) of 1851' provides as follows: 'This Act shall not extend or apply to the assumption or use by any Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland, exercising episcopal functions within some

years he described it as 3 per cent.). In the Diocese which he was called upon to administer, it had, with the partial exceptions of Perth, Forfar, and Muthill, no such strong traditional centres as exist in the great towns of Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dundee, and Aberdeen. At the end of his life the total Church population of the Diocese was returned as under 7,000, and it had largely increased in forty years. It was, in fact, to a flock of only about 3,239 souls, divided among some twenty-one charges, that he was at the first called to minister. We can readily imagine what a constant disproportion he must have felt between his will and power to guide and teach on the one side and the willingness of those about him to be guided.

Nor could he be blind to the many points of difference and of superiority which marked the position of the Presbyterian clergy and their flocks when compared, for instance, with the majority of the dissenting ministers and their congregations in England. The Genevan polity, introduced by Melville, though much out of harmony with our ways of thought and feeling in the Church of England, nevertheless retained and exhibited many of the elements of true Church life, and discharged many of the educational functions which are characteristic of a national Church.¹

It was a polity, not a conglomerate of varying congregations. Not only in the Establishment, but in the two great schisms from it there was strong parochial feeling—a realisation that every resident in a place stood or ought to stand in some relation to the Christian religion. The

district or place in Scotland, of any name, style, or title in respect of such district or place, but nothing herein contained shall be taken to give any right to any such Bishop to assume or use any name, style, or title which he is not now by law entitled to assume or use.' This Act was repealed in 1871 by 34 & 35 Vict. c. 53.

¹ In illustration of what I mean, I may be permitted to refer to my Charge of 1894 (part 2), entitled *The Educational Functions of a National Church* (Salisbury: Brown & Co.).

minister was often a true ‘*persona ecclesiæ*,’ a parson with pastoral habits and instincts, not merely or chiefly a preacher. We may believe that this attitude, especially in the Established Church, has been much stimulated by the presence and example of the Episcopal clergy; but there was a basis prepared for it to grow upon, and during the lifetime of Bishop Wordsworth it was constantly growing. The ‘Elders’ and heads of families formed a religious Parish Council or ‘Kirk Session,’ which was perhaps often fidgetty and wrong-headed; but its work interested them, and their friends and relations, in the doctrine, worship, and discipline of the Church, as well as in its finance, and thus realised a side of Church life which is often felt to be defective in England. Above the Parish was the Presbytery, and then again the Synod representing something like a Diocesan area, and, more important still, the General Assembly, the backbone of the whole system. More than all this organisation, the mass of the people, baptised Christians,¹ and better instructed in the details of their faith than the majority of our own people, and none the less ‘members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven,’ were zealous believers in the Presbyterian system, and had many evidences of the presence of the Holy Spirit among them. English people have recently had their minds opened to the depth and reality of religious feeling among the Scottish poor by the humorous and pathetic descriptive sketches of Messrs. Barrie and Crockett, and even more by those of the Free Church minister who writes under the name of ‘Ian Maclaren.’² It may be interesting

¹ Something will be said on Presbyterian Baptism in Chap. III., p. 58 foll. The subject was one discussed in the Bishop’s first Charge, September 1854.

² In this connection Mr. Barrie’s best work must be considered to be *A Window in Thrums*, and *Auld Licht Idylls*, and Mr. S. R. Crockett’s two volumes of sketches, called *The Stickit Minister and some Common Men*,

to the reader to be reminded that the valley and village which is idealised in 'Drumtochy' is understood to be close to Trinity College, Glenalmond, while the 'Thrums' of the first writer is known to be Kirriemuir in Forfarshire, also in the Diocese. But merely from a literary point of view these characteristics were evident to every careful reader of Sir Walter Scott and William Wordsworth. Burns's 'Cottar's Saturday Night' had long been a classic, and Galt's 'Annals of the Parish,' published in 1821, might almost seem worthy to be called the Scottish 'Vicar of Wakefield.' But specially would Charles Wordsworth feel the attraction of such pictures as those drawn by his uncle of the Leech-gatherer in the short poem called 'Resolution and Independence,' and the longer and more detailed portraiture of the humble Wanderer—a gentle and philosophic pedlar—who may be called the hero of the 'Excursion.'

Such passages as the following from the first book of the 'Excursion' must have had a peculiar attraction for him :

Among the hills of Athol was he born ;
 Where, on a small hereditary farm,
 An unproductive slip of rugged ground,
 His parents, with their numerous offspring, dwelt ;
 A virtuous household, though exceeding poor !
 Pure livers were they all, austere and grave,
 And fearing God ; the very children taught
 Stern self-respect, a reverence for God's Word,
 And an habitual piety, maintained
 With strictness scarcely known on English ground.

and *Bog-Myrtle and Peat*—chiefly tales of Galloway. But from the point of view of the historian of religion, perhaps Mr. Watson's idealised Perthshire villagers make even more impression. I believe that the volume *Beside the Bonnie Briar-bush* has passed its hundredth thousand. I saw it first in Australia and New Zealand, where it seemed to be as popular as at home.

And then again from the same book describing the same character :

The Scottish Church, both on himself and those
 With whom from childhood he grew up, had held
 The strong hand of her purity ; and still
 Had watched him with an unrelenting eye.
 This he remembered in his riper age
 With gratitude, and reverential thoughts.
 But by the native vigour of his mind,
 By his habitual wanderings out of doors,
 By loneliness and goodness and kind works,
 Whate'er in docile childhood or in youth,
 He had imbibed of fear or darker thought
 Was melted all away : so true was this,
 That sometimes his religion seemed to me
 Self-taught, as of a dreamer in the woods.

Nor was the slow deliberate way of speaking, habitual to many Scotsmen, uncongenial to one who was so careful in his own choice of language. The reader will not be sorry to have William Wordsworth's description of it, in the person of the Leech-gatherer, recalled to his mind :

His words came feebly from a feeble chest,
 But each in solemn order followed each,
 With something of a lofty utterance drest—
 Choice words and measured phrase, above the reach
 Of ordinary men ; a stately speech
 Such as grave livers do in Scotland use,
 Religious men who give to God and man their dues.

As long as the Bishop remained specially connected with Glenalmond, and to a great extent absorbed in daily scholastic duties, the force of these considerations would not be so strongly felt, though felt it undoubtedly was. But when removed from it and thrown upon himself to answer the question how he could best spend his time to the glory of God and the increase of Christ's Kingdom, he

could not long doubt about the answer. He could best serve God by doing his best to reconcile the Presbyterians to the ancient Church and thus to create one united body of Christ, primitive, Apostolic, and orthodox, for the three kingdoms. This became the leading principle of his life, and gave a unity and a dignity to it which otherwise, in so small a sphere, it might have lacked. It was for this idea that he lived. Other interests, both literary and religious, though pursued with the eagerness and love of completeness which distinguished all he did, came more and more to be subsidiary to this great end.

Such was the basis of his after life, and when the practical question was raised, by what steps and through what means reunion was to be effected, two answers arose as naturally as the first. The primary necessity of all was to prevent the capture of the Scottish Episcopal Church by a party, especially by a party manned by Englishmen and controlled from England. The duty forced upon him, as he supposed, by the circumstances of his election was to prevent the Church from drifting into a mere Donatising sect (as he sometimes thought of it), very narrow, and at the same time high and arrogant ; to avoid giving offence to Presbyterian prejudices, and to present the whole Church to the nation in as Scriptural and reasonable a form as possible.

The second duty was to convince the strong Scottish understanding that their own way was, at least in part wrong, and that ours was, in some respects at least, more right. These two duties were taken in hand at once and pursued, with more or less persistency, to the end of his long life. A third emerged and developed in course of time as the strength of the National Presbyterian ' Church of Scotland ' was better understood by him, and the chequered course of the history of the country, and the nature of the precedents for approaches to union, became

more familiar in detail. This was the duty, as he conceived it, of making concessions on the part of Episcopalians, whereby the principle of Episcopacy should be saved, while temporary expedients might be adopted to make the reconciliation less uncongenial to the bulk of the people and especially to their ministers. Coincident with this conviction came his practice of cultivating friendly relations with Presbyterians, especially when asked to preach on special occasions in their churches.

The following pages will exhibit the working of these convictions in the Bishop's mind—the first especially in his relations with St. Ninian's Cathedral and his action in the Eucharistic controversy—and in his attempts to promote the co-operation of the laity in Church Government. The second effort was mainly a literary and social one, and exhibited itself not so much in private correspondence as in letters to the newspapers, an instrument of which he made unreserved use, and in a long series of Charges, tracts, books, and lectures in defence of the Episcopal position. Four of these may be particularly named, two of them specially referring to Scotland, viz. a 'Discourse on the Scottish Reformation' published in 1861, and a 'Discourse on Scottish Church History from the Reformation to the Present Time' in 1881, and two on the general subject of the three-fold ministry, viz. 'Outlines of the Christian Ministry,' published in 1872, followed by 'Remarks on Bishop Lightfoot's Essay on the Christian Ministry,' which appeared in 1879.

The whole subject of Reunion is treated in various aspects in the two volumes of 'Public Appeals on Behalf of Christian Unity,' in which he collected and republished a number of his previous addresses, connecting them together by valuable introductions in which he summarised the progress of opinion on his own part and that of others.

These two volumes were issued in twelve parts in 1886, and culminated in the last number, entitled 'The Case of non-Episcopal Ordination in reference to Scotland fairly considered' (a Synodal address delivered at Perth, 3 September, 1885), in which he stated the kind of compromise he was prepared to recommend should the matter ever come to a practical issue. Up to the last fortnight of his life he was still vigorously at work on the same topic, the most important of his later utterances being his powerful letter to the late Archbishop Benson of Canterbury in 1888, and his Charge to his Diocese after the Lambeth Conference was over. Previous to these publications he had, as I have said, taken advantage of opportunities of co-operation with Presbyterians by preaching and lecturing to audiences in which they formed the principal part. The College pulpit of St. Andrews, of which University he became an honorary D.D. in 1884, afforded him a sort of neutral ground, as we shall see in a later chapter (Chap. VII.). He also delivered an address to the students of Aberdeen in the hall of Marischal College on Sunday evening, 21 February, 1886. He prepared a similar address (which he did not deliver) to the members of the Young Men's Christian Association of St. Cuthbert's Parish in Edinburgh, which he issued on St. Andrew's Day of the same year under the title, 'The Yoke of Christ to be borne in Youth.' One of his last public appearances outside his Diocese was to preach a 'Commemoration Sermon' before the University of Edinburgh in St. Giles' Cathedral, 18 April, 1889, the subject being 'A Threefold Rule of Christian Duty needed for these Times.' This refers to his text, 1 Thess. v. 21, 22: 'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good. Abstain from all appearance of evil.'

CHAPTER III

EARLY EPISCOPATE. 1853—1856¹

‘Crescunt dona, crescunt rationes.’

Early Episcopate—Perth—Early history of St. Ninian’s Cathedral—Bishop Torry’s Statutes—Characters of Provost Fortescue and Canon Humble—Revised Constitution accepted—Enthronement—Primary Charge (1854)—The validity of Presbyterian Baptism—The author’s judgment on it—Residence at Muthill till Easter 1855—Beginnings of the Eucharistic Controversy—Attacks upon the Scottish Office—Three Sermons on Holy Communion and their value—Extracts from them—Charles Wordsworth’s attitude at various times (1858, 1859, 1862, 1884, 1889) towards the Scottish Office—The formula of Invocation in it—Suggestions for the amendment of the Consecration Prayer—His final judgment—The Bishop at Dunkeld—Finds a home after three years at Pitcullen Bank, Perth—End of ‘Annals, August 1856—‘Papal aggression in the East’—The Feu House (1858)—The Bishop’s taste.

AFTER leaving Glenalmond, which he and his family relinquished with many tender regrets, the Bishop took his usual midsummer holiday in England, which included, as of course, visits to his wife’s home at Burghelere and to Warden Barter at Winchester, and on many occasions also to my father’s country vicarage at Stanford, in the Vale of White Horse, Berks, or to his canonical house at Westminster.² Early in September he returned to Perth, the city which was afterwards to be his home for about twenty years, where he at first resided in lodgings in Rose Terrace, an open situation, with good views in front of it.

Those who know anything of Scotland are generally

¹ See *Annals* ii., chap. ix. The motto is from one of the Bishop’s almanacks.

² This is the house in Little Cloisters, now inhabited by Canon Charles Gore and the Community of the Resurrection, and is therefore still happily a home of Christian learning.

more or less familiar with Perth, which, as one of the keys of the Highlands,¹ has a position scarcely surpassed by that of any city in the United Kingdom. It lies compact and foursquare between two fair, green riverside meadows, the North and South Inches, presenting all the appearance of having grown out of a Roman encampment, such as that practical nature would naturally have placed on so commanding a site. The Tay, which here almost becomes an estuary, flows broad and strong past the city and its two meadows; a nobler Tiber past a nobler field of Mars, as local patriotism is fond of reflecting. To the north, across the Tay, lies Scone Palace, the ancient home of kings, and the meeting place of many Scottish Parliaments and Councils. To the south-east and south lie Kinnoul and Moncreiffe Hills, forming a picturesque background, and delightful breathing places to those who feel the lower level relaxing. The river is crossed by one bridge at the north-east corner of the ancient city, taking the place of a more central one which was destroyed in 1621. The railway bridge from the south-east is accessible also to foot-passengers.

Perth is the only town of large population in the Diocese, and it is, no doubt, the most central place in it. It was in ancient times in the Diocese of St. Andrews,² though not in the same county, being no doubt connected with it through

¹ The other would, I suppose, be Stirling, and perhaps Dunblane.

² My uncle has this note in his Virgil *Notebook*: 'It is curious that Bishop Torry, in 1810 and after [1847, see *Life* by Neale, p. 302], is under the mistake of supposing that Perth was in his Diocese as Bishop of Dunkeld. It is in the Diocese of St. Andrews. At the latter date he had been Bishop of St. Andrews, and was therefore justified in writing thus.' He became Bishop of Fife, I think, in 1838, and took the title of St. Andrews in 1844. The old arrangement may be seen by looking at the map given by Skene of the dioceses in the time of David I., reproduced in W. Stephen's *History of the Scottish Church*, i. chap. xix., 1894. But Bishop Torry probably thought of the customary division of his own times, when 'Fife' was still a diocesan district.

the fact that kings resided constantly both in its own castle and at Scone. But it was also easily accessible to the two other united dioceses, which St. Andrews itself is not. It was therefore very naturally chosen by the promoters of the Cathedral scheme in the time of Bishop Torry as the site for their new institution.

In order to understand the position of things which Bishop Wordsworth found here when he left Glenalmond, and was considering where he should settle, we must go back for a few years and trace the outline at least of the history of St. Ninian's from 1847 to 1854, and particularly recall its constitution and the character of the persons who had most to do with its management.

At the time of Bishop Torry's death the Cathedral had been in actual existence as a building for about two years. The scheme had been first proposed by Lord Forbes,¹ and recommended by the Bishop in August 1847. Two years later the first stone of the church was laid (16 September, 1849), and rather more than a year after that the first portion of the Cathedral, including the chancel, was consecrated 11 December, 1850, by Bishop Forbes of Brechin, acting by commission for Bishop Torry.

A few weeks later the aged Bishop gave his formal approval to the Statutes of the Cathedral (6 January, 1851). He survived long enough to hear of its working with some measure of efficiency and with considerable beauty of worship, but he passed away on 3 October, 1852. He never, I believe, saw the building, but was buried in it ten days later.

The constitution of the Cathedral body was a somewhat irregular one. It was never submitted to the Synod nor was it communicated to the clergy. What authority it possessed

¹ Farquhar's *Episcopal History of Perth*, p. 282.

proceeded entirely from the Bishop's sanction.¹ There may have been ages in which such sanction alone would have been sufficient to establish a Chapter. but such power could hardly be supposed to be practically in existence in the Scottish Church of the nineteenth century, in which Synodal government was so definitely and in some respects so strongly developed. Nor was the constitution in itself one which could naturally commend itself to the Diocese, or to Bishop Torry's own successor, when it was tried and put in action. The following account of it is given by a member of the present Chapter, Canon George Farquhar, in his valuable recent volume, 'The Episcopal History of Perth.'²

Cathedral Statutes.

The Statutes were twenty-seven in number, and, especially in view of future events, it will be necessary to indicate their leading features. All the real power was lodged in the lesser Chapter—that is, in the Dean and Canons residentiary. The entire patronage was in their hands—that is, they elected the Dean, Canons, Prebendaries, and appointed all other officials. They could increase or decrease the number of these. They had the right of altering the Constitution; and thus they took the initiative in everything. The position of the *Bishop* was of a more passive kind: ordinarily the work of the institution would go on without him. He had *no more authority over the Cathedral* than over any other incumbency. He was to adjudge all disputes *when referred to him*; he had a veto upon all appointments, and everything that was done was ineffectual without his ratification. The Scottish Communion Office, with the ancient usages thereof, was to be exclusively used in the Cathedral. The clergy of the Diocese were hardly connected with the foundation;

¹ Both the old and the new constitution may be found *in extenso* in the Appendix to Canon Humble's *Letter to the Bishop of St. Andrews* (Masters, Lond. 1859, pp. 63–68).

² By Geo. T. S. Farquhar, M.A., Canon and Precentor of Perth Cathedral and Supernumerary of the Diocese (Perth: James H. Jackson, 20 High Street, pp. 299 foll. 1894).

since, when installing the Prebendaries, the Chapter were not free to select from the whole body, but must only choose those who held incumbencies founded by the Cathedral, or the patronage of which was somehow vested in the hands of its officials.

The only point of interest in this constitution not touched upon by Canon Farquhar is the modified provision for celibacy in section XII.: 'It is hereby provided that the Dean and Canons remain unmarried so long as they continue to be resident in the college attached to the Cathedral Church.'

The idea was to build a college or clergy-house for the residence of the Cathedral body; but this never went further than the taking of a private house as a school, which was to be for a lower class of boys than those who could go to Glenalmond, and to furnish the materials for a choir.¹ The relation of the Bishop to the Chapter was not, however, as Canon Farquhar seems to imply, even as authoritative as that of the Bishop in respect to an ordinary incumbent. It was not, and was clearly not intended to be, so effective in its control or power of intervention. It was rather intended to be that of a Bishop towards one of the cathedrals of the old foundation in England, e.g. such as Lincoln, Wells, or Salisbury. He was to be visitor, and with a strictly defined visitatorial power, with a right of hearing complaints and ratifying new statutes, and sanctioning certain new departures and appointments. It is not clear that he would even have had the right to visit 'proprio motu'—that is, when he thought it expedient. Certainly there was no provision for his taking any part in the Cathedral services or preaching at his own will, as, of course, he can do at any

¹ See Farquhar's *History*, pp. 297, 305, 'the dining-hall of St. Ninian's College.' 314: 'The maximum number of boarders at any one time was 30, of whom 16 were choristers. There was, besides, a school for the poor, the largest attendance at which was 80.'

church or chapel of the Diocese to which he has instituted an incumbent.

The attempt was, in fact, to transfer bodily to Scotland an institution of a very English character, such as is suitable to a strong and well-endowed corporation with a lengthy history and traditions, and having a large population round it, and in a Church where the Bishop's incessant occupations are such that he can only give a small portion of the time to the affairs of his Cathedral, even if he be resident in close proximity to it. All the members of the resident body were Englishmen. The three canons were, Rev. John Charles Chambers,¹ chancellor; Rev. Henry Humble, chaunter or precentor; and Rev. Joseph Haskoll,² sacristan—with the duties of the treasurer in one of our ancient cathedrals. These three first asked Mr. Kenrick to undertake the office of Dean, and then Dr. J. M. Neale. They then, being unsuccessful in both these directions, elected the Rev. Edward Bowles Knottesford Fortescue on 7 January, 1851, the day after the Statutes had been signed by the Bishop. He was instituted in June of the same year.

Of the body so constituted, only two continued to reside after Bishop Wordsworth settled at Perth. The other two, Canons Chambers and Haskoll, went out of residence in 1853,³ leaving as the chief supporters and authorities of

¹ Mr. Chambers resigned 17 June, 1853, and became Incumbent of St. Mary Magdalen's, Harlow, and in 1856 of St. Mary's, Crown Street, Soho.

² Mr. Haskoll ceased to reside in 1853, and became Incumbent of Laurencekirk, and in 1854 Rector of East Barkwith, in Lincolnshire. He was a man of literary abilities.

³ The Bishop appointed as their successors Rev. J. A. Sellar and Rev. R. Campbell. Mr. Sellar was educated at Glenalmond, and was ordained to the Glenalmond Mission. He then became a Master there, and, when he was transferred to Perth, was put in charge of the Choir School there. He resigned in 1858 from want of sufficient means of support to the Cathedral, and was afterwards for many years Incumbent of St. Peter's, Edinburgh. Mr. Campbell resigned in 1856 for the same reason, and soon afterwards joined the Church of Rome.

St. Ninian's the Dean, afterwards better known as Provost Fortescue, and Canon Humble.

As these two members of the Chapter were for a number of years in close relations with the Bishop, and often, unhappily, in relations of constraint and conflict, it is right that the reader should have some detailed description of their character. I have been fortunate enough to obtain it, partly from general report, but more particularly from the hand of one who was personally friendly to them, and who sympathised with them in many of their views and practices, so that it may, I believe, be considered free, at any rate, from bias against them.

Provost Fortescue, who was educated at Wadham College, Oxford, was at the time of his election as Dean perpetual curate of Wilmcote in Worcestershire, near Stratford-on-Avon. He was a gentleman of refinement and of good family;¹ married (since 1838) to Miss Frances Anne Spooner, daughter of the Archdeacon of Coventry, and sister to Mrs. A. C. Tait. He was a man rather of feeling than of learning, but thoughtful and able; and one who exercised considerable influence, both by his preaching and his personal intercourse. He was, however, wholly unversed in Scottish affairs and ways of thought, and was in many things fanciful and unpractical, and deficient in some of the stronger qualities of character. The following description of his outward man, and his way of thinking and acting, will be read with interest.²

In dress Provost Fortescue was carefully clerical, but in old-fashioned style. Although not much, if at all, below the average height, he looked shorter from his habit of holding his head

¹ He was son of the Rev. Francis Fortescue-Knottesford, Rector of Billesley, co. Warwick, and connected with the family of Lord Carlingford.

² This and the notice of Canon Humble are from the pen of Provost T. I. Ball, of Cumbrae.

rather bent and forward. His face usually wore a grave and rather mysterious look, and he seemed sensitively to shrink from anything like a familiar gaze. If he did not like his company, or did not feel sure of it, Provost Fortescue used to adopt a somewhat donnish, reserved, enigmatical manner, and spoke little and (apparently) unwillingly. When at his ease, however, he could talk much and with great animation, and when it pleased him, in a select circle, freely to unbend, he was full of mirth, and could tell or enjoy a good story with the best. The Provost read very little, but thought a good deal. I do not know that he took, or pretended to take, much interest in things in general, though he enjoyed stories which illustrated the variations of human nature. Otherwise his tastes were exclusively ecclesiastical. Art he only cared for in any form so far as he thought it expressed correct ecclesiastical ideas. His theology was fundamentally that of the advanced High Church School. In his public teaching he was generally content to set forth clearly and plainly, and in the very striking manner which he could employ, the orthodox aspect of doctrine and practice. But in private talk or conference his great delight seemed to be as paradoxical as possible, and he seemed to take pleasure in bewildering his listeners by startling and apparently inconsistent statements. A favourite way of his was to maintain the tenability of the most ultra-Roman opinions on all subjects. This reckless manner of argument, which was with him (at all events for many years) only a wayward *jeu d'esprit*, sometimes had unhappy consequences. Sometimes, however, all his power of paradox was put forth to maintain the perfection of something Anglican which most men of his school would consider to be among *reformanda*. In his own house he could be a charming host; for behind all his waywardness and whimsical ways you could see the English gentleman; but he shrank (as I have said) from unsympathetic company. A man of this disposition was not made for fighting, and when ecclesiastical differences arose his inclination was to come to terms, or to look round for a loophole of escape. Even when not on harmonious terms with Bishop Wordsworth he was fond of saying, in his characteristic way, that there was something 'supernatural,' the effect of the divine *charisma* which a Bishop possesses, in that prelate's official utterances.

He continued to be Provost till 1871, but resigned that office in July of that year. Upon his resignation he married (as his second wife) a lady of the congregation (Miss Robbins), and both he and his wife simultaneously entered the Church of Rome, I believe in Belgium.

The circumstances of his leaving the communion of the Church in Scotland were such as to produce great discouragement to his friends, and especially to members of his congregation, by whom he was much beloved. They were necessarily followed by much sorrow to himself; for in the Roman communion he of course suddenly ceased to be recognised as a Priest, or to be able to consider himself as such, though his whole previous life had been involved in the habits of thought and action proper to that character. I have evidence, not exactly that he repented of what he had done, but that he was not contented with what he found in his new communion, and that he continued to take a strong and respectful interest in everything connected with the Anglican Church.

Canon Humble, the other leader of the Chapter, was a man of very different character and antecedents. He came from the Diocese of Durham, of which he was a native, and was educated at the newly-founded University there. He was a member of a family much respected in the City. His father was proprietor of the 'Durham Advertiser' and he was for a time himself its editor. There can be little doubt that his early training in journalism largely influenced his after style, and gave him the habit of writing aggressively and without sufficient consideration of his opponents. He was for a time tutor at Castle Forbes, six or seven miles above Monymusk, in the valley of the Don. As a clergyman he is described as a good man and a hard worker, especially among the poor and middle-class members of his congregation. But he was essentially combative, and I fear I must add self-

willed. His strong will dominated the Chapter both in the time of Provost Fortescue and his successor. He was not, however, a man of strong health, and he died of consumption in the early part of 1876.

The same able pen that has sketched for us Provost Fortescue has kindly delineated the person and character of his subordinate but more powerful companion.

Canon Humble was a typical Englishman of the educated middle-class. He was of average height, broadly built; he held his head upright, slightly thrown back; he had a rather large nose, strong and determined looking, though not of the classic Roman shape. His dress was always strictly clerical, of rather old-fashioned cut, without a trace of ecclesiastical foppery about it. In manner Canon Humble was friendly, frank, and open. His kindness and courtesy saved him, but perhaps only just saved him, from a tendency to *brusquerie*. The Canon had read much, and thought much, on a great many subjects; his interests were wide and general, but they were chiefly concentrated on all that related to his profession. He was a good talker, had a great fund of humour, and was full of common sense; his judgment on ordinary matters of life was sober and clear, and he was eminently a man who attracted confidence. He was given to hospitality, and was ready to open his purse to those in need. He was an ardent disciple of the Tractarian Movement as represented by Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, but always set himself against anything like mere extravagance or excess. His piety (as far as one may presume to judge of it) was deep and sincere, but was entirely unostentatious. Though in friendly and social intercourse Canon Humble never showed anything even approaching to quarrelsomeness, contentiousness, touchiness, or ill-temper (or even quick temper), yet he was a born warrior. He smelt the battle afar off. One thing that especially incited him to gird on his armour was anything that seemed to him like oppression, or the taking of unfair advantage of the weaker by the stronger. Those who loved and admired him most often regretted the eager way in which he sometimes threw himself into the defence of persons the *reality* of whose wrongs was not above suspicion. And so it will be easily under-

stood how that, when ecclesiastical differences arose, Canon Humble's line was, not that they should be composed or accommodated, but that the matter should be *fought out*. Even those who most agreed with him theologically were often not a little dismayed at his eagerness to fight, and in Dundee, where the line taken in ecclesiastical matters, under the suave rule of Bishop Forbes, was ruled by reserve, prudence, and diplomacy, Canon Humble was regarded as the *enfant terrible* of the advanced High Church school in those parts. Many of those who loved and revered him most sincerely (including, I may perhaps be allowed to say, myself) did their best to persuade him to desist from his last contest with Bishop Wordsworth, but all in vain—the battle must be fought. It was lost, and I know he felt keenly the want of sympathy with him that his friends showed in the matter. But what could we do? It was one of those cases in which affection looks one way and judgment and reason another. When the news arrived of Canon Humble's death at San Remo, they who really knew and valued him did not feel that a war-making spirit was at rest so much as that they had lost a brave and loyal friend, on whose kindness and generosity they could always rely.

It was with these two men, who while they differed largely from each other, differed yet more thoroughly from himself, that Charles Wordsworth was called to live and work in close proximity. Had he lived at a distance from them in the same Diocese he might conceivably have been, outwardly at least, at peace with them; but the Cathedral would in that case have been a very isolated institution, and much out of harmony with all his plans and hopes for the Diocese and for Scotland in general. He was bound either to leave the Cathedral severely alone and to show himself in no way responsible for it; or to take it well in hand and to mould it into his scheme of work. He determined, I think with good reason, to adopt the latter course.

The new Bishop, though he felt that the Cathedral

scheme was premature and open to many objections, had thought it right to give it a modified, but very decided support. His reasons for objecting to it were clear. It was a very expensive scheme, and was therefore in that matter a rival to Glenalmond. It was or might be a rival also to some extent as a place of education. Its constitution was open to much criticism. It was a kind of outpost of the Tractarian party in England, and was in the Diocese without really belonging to it. It was largely controlled by two generous laymen, who had no property in the Diocese, and were neither of them much in touch with residents in it.¹ On the other hand, it was in its essence an institution with which he was bound by the traditions of his family to be in sympathy. It was not only the first Cathedral established across the Tweed, but, in the words of Dr. Neale,² 'the first British Cathedral (with the single exception of St. Paul's) that had been consecrated since the Reformation.' It was a great venture of faith, and many hopes were centred on it.

He therefore at once took steps to give it a legal standing in the Diocese by inducing its promoters to accept a revised constitution for it, and by persuading those who looked coldly upon it to recognise it as a Cathedral for the Diocese. This somewhat difficult task was achieved by his wise conduct of business at two synods held at Trinity College, Glenalmond, the first a Special Synod on 6 April, 1853, and the second at his first Annual Synod on 6 July of the same year. At the first of these meetings, to which laymen were for the first time invited (to speak, but not to vote), the Cathedral was *ad interim* accepted, subject to

¹ Lord Forbes and Hon. G. F. Boyle, afterwards Earl of Glasgow, who died in 1890. As Earl of Glasgow he inherited Crawford Priory, in Fifeshire, but this was not till 1869.

² *Life of Torry*, p. 367.

some general resolutions as to the composition of the Chapter and a revision of the Statutes by the Bishop. This recognition was balanced with a proviso that the acceptance was also subject to the approval of the next General Synod of the Church. At the second meeting the draft 'Code of Statutes' was proposed by him and accepted unanimously. At the same time he gave notice of his intention to summon the laity to meet at a visitation to be held the day following the Annual Synod, which was appointed to be held at the Cathedral on the third Wednesday in September 1854. The two main objects of the revision of the Cathedral Statutes were, of course, to ensure the proper influence and authority of the Bishop, both in the way of appointments and in regard to the control of the services, and to connect the Cathedral more closely with the Diocese.

The following summary of the changes made may be quoted from Canon Farquhar's 'History,' premising that the whole relation of the Bishop to the Chapter was governed by the following general clause (in Art. 2) :

The clergy of the Cathedral shall be subject to the Bishop and amenable to Canonical jurisdiction—provincial and diocesan—in all respects as the other clergy of the Diocese.

Article 4 was also of great importance :

It shall be the duty of the Provost (under the Bishop) to govern the whole institution, cathedral, and collegiate, to superintend and control the performance of all Divine offices, and especially to take the chief part in preaching sermons.

These regulations were supposed at the time by all concerned to give the Bishop plenary powers in the Cathedral. Mr. Boyle, then secretary and treasurer for the Cathedral scheme, wrote to the Bishop (19 May, 1853) :

I should rejoice to see the Cathedral really yours, and worked as such.

And again on the 24th :

After much thought and prayer I have come to these conclusions :

1. That the scheme as embodied in your Lordship's Draft of a Constitution is the best that can be adopted. It ought to do much to allay the suspicion with which the Cathedral scheme is so generally regarded, as it will no longer be worked by a few individuals, but by the Bishop of the Diocese, and under his unlimited control and supervision.

2. That so far as I am personally concerned, I will only work in your Lordship's Diocese in such a way as a layman can do so, in entire accordance with your wishes, and as far as possible in the manner in which you most recommend. I could not for one moment think of affording any support to St. Ninian's were it to assume a tone of opposition to its Bishop.

It should be said that the new Statutes were drawn up by the Bishop, with the help of the Rev. John Jebb, Prebendary of Hereford, a man of great knowledge and authority on all subjects connected with Church law and order, but especially as regards Cathedrals. The Bishop's leading idea was (as Canon Farquhar well remarks¹) that the Chapter should be no longer an *imperium in imperio*—a close corporation, independent of the Bishop and the Diocese. He desired, on the contrary, as he himself said, 'to maintain the unity and singleness of Diocesan Episcopacy; not according to the mediæval plan of checks and counterpoises of government (which arose in part out of the aggrandising spirit of the Church of Rome).'

Accordingly his new code depressed the power of the *Chapter*. They were no longer to have the appointment of the Dean, Canons, and other officials exclusively in their own hands; they were no longer to be the sole originators of all business at the

¹ *Episcopal History of Perth*, p. 338 foll.

meetings ; they were no longer to have power to increase and decrease the number of stalls at their pleasure ; in fact, the initiative in the government of the institution was to be no longer theirs. They were to act strictly under the *Bishop*, whose powers therefore were largely increased ; he was to be no longer passive and merely sanctioning or vetoing what came up to him from the Chapter. He was to be the ordinary president of the Chapter ; he was to initiate all business there ; he was to have the power of proceeding against the members of the Chapter for insubordination &c., and of making new laws or altering the Statutes, provided he obtained a two-thirds majority. As regards the *Clergy of the Diocese*, they were to be so connected with the Cathedral that, the patronage of the Chapter having been done away, the five oldest Presbyters in the Diocese were always to be invited to become Prebendaries. Thus every school of thought would have an opening. As for the *Scottish Communion Office*, though he would not interfere with its actual exclusive use, yet it must not stand on the formal Statutes of the Cathedral that any Canonical Service, such as the *English Office*, was to be constitutionally excluded.

The Bishop was able to carry this constitution by reason that the body of Presbyters in his Synod was still exactly divided—the half who had supported his election being opposed to any recognition of the Cathedral, while the other half, who had opposed him, supported it. These latter, therefore, needed and welcomed his influence and authority in order to obtain for it a regular position in the Diocese. His wise use of this opportunity was of great advantage to him at the commencement of his Episcopate, and gave fair promise for the future. The Cathedral became a Diocesan institution, and as such is now well established and successful ; but curiously enough the formal ratification of the act of the Diocesan Synod, which should have been given by the next General Synod, was never asked for in 1862 and cathedrals attained no Canonical status in Scotland generally until 1890.

Coincidentally with the acceptance of the constitution certain minor changes were made in the ritual at the Bishop's suggestion, and about the same time two new Canons were appointed to take the place of those who had gone out of residence, one of whom (Rev. J. R. Sellar) was specially to undertake the educational work of the choir school. The Bishop was enthroned at St. Ninian's on St. Matthew's Day, 21 September, 1853, and preached a sermon suitable to the day—'St. Matthew an Example to Scotland'—in which he specially tried to move Episcopalian landowners to dedicate their sons to the ministry of the Church. The sermon also contained a warning to the Cathedral clergy to be careful not to give offence by disloyal innovations, a hint which at that time they might be expected to take in good part. Both parties had made sacrifices, and for a time it seemed that it would be possible for the Bishop's great gifts as a preacher to find a sphere of exercise in a Church where beauty of worship and a high standard of devotion were also manifest, so that the ideal excellence of the Church might be exhibited before the world in something like completeness. Here for five years (1854-1858) he constantly preached, and here he held Diocesan Synods and Visitations, including both clergy and laity, and this annually on two consecutive days.

The actual building of St. Ninian's was at this time and for many years afterwards only a fragment of Mr. Butterfield's design, consisting of the choir, dwarf transepts, and one bay of the nave, and was capable of containing a congregation of about 350 persons. It was high in proportion to its length, and the chancel was raised above the nave, and thus it already exhibited some of the dignity and impressiveness which the completed interior certainly possesses. It stands in the north-west corner of the city, near the infantry barracks and on the Dunkeld

road. The only other Episcopal church was St. John the Baptist's in Princes Street, towards the south-east of the city, and therefore almost as far as possible from the Cathedral, and so placed as not to interfere with its congregation.¹ It was natural that this name should be chosen in a city which in early days was usually called St. John's town or St. Johnston, but now that the old church in the centre of the city—where Knox preached the iconoclasm which was so speedily put in practice—has recovered its ancient name, there is some danger, perhaps, of confusion. A school chapel close to the Central Railway Station was also built by my uncle's instrumentality in 1868, and has our family motto, 'VERITAS,' over the principal entrance. It is now no longer used for Divine service.

The residence at Rose Terrace, Perth, with a mention of which this chapter began, was not of long duration. It included, however, an important annual event—the second regular Diocesan Synod. This took place on the anniversary of his enthronisation, St. Matthew's Day (21 September, 1854), and was followed on the next day by the Visitation, at which laymen attended, and at which he took occasion to deliver his Primary Charge.

This Charge, the first of a series of important deliverances, contained a considerable amount of matter bearing on the subject of Reunion with Presbyterians, and in particular a recognition of the reality of their Baptism, which the Bishop held to be valid though irregular. In this admission he was dissociating himself from his pre-

¹ In 1849 the congregation of St. John's, Perth, was reunited to the Church after a separation of nearly fifty years. My uncle, then Warden of Glenalmond, desired that the two congregations should be moulded into one, and published a pamphlet on the subject, *A Call to Union*. See *Annals*, ii. 66 foll. But neither party would combine with the other. The new St. John's Church was consecrated by Bishop Trower, of Glasgow, acting for Bishop Torry, in 1850.

decessor, Bishop Torry, and the general policy of the non-jurors, and making the first and most essential step in the advances which he was so much drawn to extend in later years. The Charge was, like nearly everything he wrote, carefully composed and guarded in its language, and well fitted to conciliate all parties of Churchmen as things then were in Scotland. It not only showed, as might have been expected, both classical and patristic learning, and a considerable acquaintance with the treatment of the subject by Anglican divines, but it also exhibited a true insight into the particular difficulties of the situation. The reader will gather its character from a few extracts, and will then be ready to consider a little more at length the special point to which his attention has been called.

It may, I think, be said without exaggeration that the clergy and people of a Christian Church have rarely met together for mutual counsel and encouragement under circumstances of deeper and more anxious moment than those in which we, my brethren, are now assembled. In a Diocese which comprehends the ruins of one Archi-Episcopal and two Episcopal sees, we have held our Synod, and now hold our Visitation for the first time, in a corner of a Cathedral which is still but half completed, but which, as it is the fruit of the first attempt that has been made to erect such an edifice in this country for upwards of three hundred years, so it can scarcely fail to cheer our desponding hearts with brighter and more hopeful thoughts. Ourselves but a small and feeble remnant: the *Laymen* of us representing, indeed, the possessors of more than half the soil, but not more than a hundredth part of the population of the three Dioceses; the *Clergy* representing in less than twenty unendowed Incumbencies the two hundred parishes and upwards, in which our forefathers ministered, reduced to struggle with difficulties of all kinds; and meanwhile having too much reason to fear that every effort which we may make to recover our lost ground, as it cannot fail to provoke the spirits of evil, and the enmity of an ungodly world, to increased hostility, so it must tend to aggravate and increase our trials, unless we are careful

to proceed in the faith and fear of God, with the utmost prudence and discretion, with the wisdom of the serpent, no less than the harmlessness of the dove (p. 6).

In his treatment of the relation of the Episcopal Church to Presbyterians he starts with the maxim of Cicero (*de Orat.* ii. 82) : ‘ Ad consilium de Republica dandum, primum est nosse Rempublicam : ad dicendum vero probabiliter (primum est) nosse mores civitatis,’ which he paraphrases ‘ In order to give good counsel concerning the Church, our first and most indispensable care must be to know the Church. To plead the Church’s cause with a good prospect of success, it is essential that we should know and consider well the character of the people among whom we live, and with whom we have to deal.’ He then proceeds with the following wise and conciliatory words :

No one, I think, can doubt that there are elements in the Scottish character which hold forth the promise and exhibit the capacity of producing fruits of holiness, richer and more mature than those which at present are commonly perceived amongst us ; but it is no less clear that there are also other elements in the same character, as it now exists, which raise more than ordinary impediments to the reception of certain portions of the Apostolical system (subjected as that system has been to so much unworthy treatment on the part both of friends and foes) ; and which must be taken into account with the utmost tenderness and forbearance if we desire to follow the example of the great Apostle, who scrupled not to ‘ become all things to all men, that he might by all means save some ’ (p. 12 foll.).

In treating of the validity of Presbyterian Baptism, he naturally follows Hooker and Bingham, and the general consent of Anglican divines, in doing which he was in company with Bishop Forbes, of Brechin.¹ He notices the dissent of the nonjurors, and the remarkable fact that

¹ See his *Explanation of the Nicene Creed*, ed. 2, p. 299, Oxf. 1866, and ep. Rev. Warwick Elwin, *The Minister of Baptism*, pp. 275 foll. Lond. 1889.

strictness in the matter also came from the Calvinistic side, and was enforced by the earlier Presbyterians :—‘ Denying as they did, and blaspheming our ministry as anti-Christian, they could not do otherwise than deny our Baptism, which, according to their teaching, none but a duly authorised minister is competent to give ’ (p. 16). But he does not notice the considerable amount of Anglican authority which there also is for the stricter practice. He mentions, indeed, the nonjurors Brett and Laurence (p. 15 *u.*), but not Waterland, whose ‘ Letters on Lay-Baptism ’¹ are very decided against its validity, and represent the judgment of a man who has always commanded respect, especially among the school of Anglicans to which the Bishop of St. Andrews belonged. Nor does he refer to Maskell, whose then recent ‘ Dissertation on Baptism ’ contains some valuable arguments on his own side. He was not, however, writing a set treatise on the subject, and was certainly justified in saying that Canon xvii. of the Scottish Code of 1838 did not enforce re-baptism, but directed conditional Baptism in cases ‘ where the applicants shall express a doubt of the validity of the Baptism which they have received from the minister of the sect to which they formerly belonged.’ Nevertheless we must remember that not only is there the question of a valid ministry, but also the doubt whether baptism has been administered at all. There is, I understand, unfortunately very good reason for this doubt in Scotland. Strangely enough, in so well educated a country, where judicial records are admirably preserved, baptismal registers have been very much neglected since 1848, even in the Established Church, in which they have long been ordered to be kept. And as the children only of

¹ They have recently been reprinted from his Works, with notes by F. Nutcombe Oxenham, and a preface by the Bishop of Argyll (Haldane Chinnery), Lond. 1892.

‘godly’ parents are admitted to Baptism, the parents are often afraid to bring them to the minister lest they should be refused. Very many, therefore, remain unbaptised.

For my own part, if I may express an opinion in passing on the general aspects of so difficult a subject, I should remark that while the command to baptise is given to the Apostles, and through them undoubtedly to the Apostolic ministry, it is, nevertheless, naturally inferred from Scripture that they rarely baptised with their own hands. St. Paul, who was justly very eager to maintain his full rights and position as an Apostle, and most unlikely to have done anything singular, or calculated to prejudice his claims to Apostolic powers, states this distinctly as regards himself (1 Cor. i. 14–17). It is matter of inference as regards the Twelve; but our Lord’s own example naturally suggests the idea that Baptism was recognised as, so to speak, a minor ministry (John iv. 2), and the remarkable fact should be noticed that the passive voice—‘they were baptised,’ &c.—is regularly used in the New Testament as regards Christian Baptism. The single exception in the Acts proves the rule, viz. that of Philip the Deacon, who, being alone with the Ethiopian, necessarily baptised him in person (Acts viii. 38), and he of course was not an Apostle. Yet of John the forerunner it is as regularly noticed that ‘he baptised,’ evidently in his own person. It seems clear from this, at any rate, that little stress was laid at first on the person who administered baptism among Christians. The faith of the recipient and the other conditions of the Sacrament are the points especially dwelt upon. See particularly Rom. vi. 4, Col. ii. 12, 1 Peter iii. 21.

When we come to sub-Apostolic times we find the same thing true. In the ‘Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,’ generally dated about the end of the first or beginning of

the second century, the directions about Baptism are general, though 'the Baptiser' is bidden to fast before it, as well as 'the Baptised.' The command to appoint 'Bishops and Deacons' is connected with the Eucharist, but not with Baptism. In the same way, in Justin Martyr, where a rather lengthy description of Baptism and the Eucharist is given, Baptism is spoken of as if administered by the whole body of faithful Christians ('Apol.' i. 61 &c.), whereas the ministry of the clergy is distinctly referred to in regard to the other sacrament. Even the well-known text of St. Ignatius, which forbids to baptise or to hold a love-feast 'without the Bishop' ('Smyrn.' 8), does not by any means necessarily imply that he was the actual minister of Baptism. Doubtless even in the second century there were two tendencies, a laxer and a stricter one, and these two have continued side by side ever since. On the one side, it is clear that the Apostles were the right persons to determine the conditions of Baptism, and in the great case of Cornelius they exercised this authority in a most momentous manner, by ratifying the decision of St. Peter, that Gentiles were to be baptised. It is further clear that Bishops succeeded generally to this authority, sometimes to such an extent, and with such a closeness of grasp, as to be the *sole* ministers of Baptism, as was the case in the Church of Milan in the fourth century.¹ On the other hand, the tradition that laymen might, under proper conditions, be ministers of Baptism has always existed in the Church, from the time, at any rate, of Tertullian, though not always without protest, and subject to greater or lesser attempts to limit it. The question as to heretical Baptism has, from

¹ See the remarkable passages on this point quoted in Smith and Cheetham, *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, s. v. Baptism, p. 166—an article by the late Wharton B. Marriott.

time to time, been diversely decided, the East tending to be stricter in this point than the West. Schismatical Baptism was, however, theoretically at least, accepted in both regions of the Church,¹ if administered in the right form and with the right matter, and with the right faith on the part of the recipient, even though the validity of the orders of the sects in question were denied. There can, therefore, I think, be no doubt that the balance of authority is in favour of a charitable acceptance of Presbyterian and Non-conformist Baptism, whenever the conditions required by the Church are adhered to, as they certainly are according to the general intention of the chief bodies into which our fellow Christians are divided. And surely in this matter the strongly-expressed design and desire of our Saviour to create one Church must count for very much. Faith and Baptism are by Him and His Apostles so closely connected, that where we find the one Faith sufficiently existing on the part of Christians, and the intention to administer the

¹ The Council of Arles, A.D. 314, which ruled the custom of the West, upheld the anti-Cyprianic view, and decreed that a convert from heresy should be asked to repeat his Creed, and if it should be found that he had been baptised 'in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto' he was only to receive imposition of hands. The Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, distinguished between the Novatian schismatics (Canon 8) and the Paulianist heretics (Canon 19). The Cathari or Novatians were accepted on rather easy terms. Nothing is said as to their baptism, which was clearly admitted, though their clergy appear to have been technically re-ordained (χειροθετουμένους αὐτοὺς μένειν οὕτως ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ), but admitted, as far as possible, to the same position as they previously held. The Paulianists, or disciples of Paul of Samosata, though there is evidence that they used the threefold name in Baptism, were to be re-baptised, and their clergy (with some formality) re-ordained. See the evidence carefully collected on these points by Dr. Wm. Bright in his *Notes to the Canons of the First Four General Councils*, pp. 25 foll. and pp. 66 foll. (Oxf. 1882). The re-ordination of the Novatian clergy is a moot point, but Dr. Bright's evidence for it appears to me sufficient, and it is the natural interpretation of Canon 8. It is, in this case, a practically decisive precedent for the admission of Presbyterian baptism. My uncle, in his *Ecclesiastical Union between Scotland and England, Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury*, 1888, supposes that they were *not* re-ordained, quoting various good authorities for his opinion (p. 18).

one Baptism equally apparent among them, we must have very clear proof indeed that the consequent blessing does not follow. And when we see in fact the fruits of the Spirit's presence following (though not always with the sweetness and maturity that we should find if all other conditions of Church-life were present), we cannot doubt that a valid Baptism has been administered.

The true policy for the Church, and the most consistent with antiquity, seems to me to be to make much of Confirmation as a perfecting of Baptism, and to be very clear and distinct in our teaching on this head. It is this view of Confirmation as an admission into the full privileges of the Catholic Church that makes it important to insist upon it in such cases as a condition preceding Holy Communion, according to the teaching of our Prayer Book. This is distinctly taught in the Charge which has led to this discussion,¹ and must be remembered as the proper safeguard of the freedom and charity which is recommended.

The reader will pardon this digression; for I take it for granted that no one is likely to read this memoir unless he is already interested in the question of Reunion, or is willing to be drawn to take interest in it. And those who know the present condition of opinion and practice in Scotland² will be aware that an attempt is sometimes made to introduce a rigorous teaching and practice on the subject, which

¹ See p. 17, where he also refers to Bingham's *Scholastical History of Lay Baptism*, part 1, ch. 1, § 21, 'What defects there are in the Baptism of heretics and schismatics, and how those defects may be supplied.' The Bishop of St. Andrews, however, did not in after years insist absolutely on Confirmation of all Presbyterians who joined the Church as *communicants*. He left a note for this volume, saying that he 'had uniformly acted on the same principle as that by which Bishop Torry was guided: see his *Life*, p. 188, 205;' *i.e.* to recommend without forcing it.

² The two books which I have quoted above, *The Minister of Baptism*, by Mr. Elwin, and the reprint of Waterland's *Letters*, are an outcome of this movement. Both are useful contributions to the history of a difficult subject.

is likely, in some degree, to endanger the efforts to which Charles Wordsworth devoted nearly all the remainder of his life.

The concluding portion of the Charge deals generally with the duty of convincing members of the truth of our own position—‘the Diocesan, Provincial, or National System’ as against the Roman—and our behaviour towards those who are separated from us. The Charge, both from its tone and its matter, was well fitted to be the prelude to such an effort as the Bishop was then steadily contemplating. It is impossible not to reflect how much more effective the result might have been if those who heard him had been content to subordinate their individual aims to a general levelling up of the small Church of which they were representatives, instead of making it a battleground for the controversies which were only just tolerable in the broader area of the Church of England.

The Charge was very well received at the time and circulated in considerable numbers at the expense of its hearers, both clerical and lay, and speedily passed into a second edition.¹

The ‘Visitation’ at which this Charge was delivered was held on the day after the Synod, and was well attended. It was continued, as I have said, for four years, when it was dropped, being held for the last time in 1858. In 1859 the strained relations with the clergy of St. Ninian’s led to the Synod being held at Dunkeld, and some other arrangements had also to be altered.

The Synod and Visitation being over, the Bishop took Mrs. Wordsworth to Bournemouth, whence he was summoned by a call of duty, the important charge of Muthill being vacant owing to the resignation of the incumbent, Mr. Lendrum. When a charge fell vacant it was his habit,

¹ *Annals*, ii. 185.

when no one else was available, to take the Sunday duty himself, sometimes for weeks in succession, going forwards and backwards from Saturday till Monday from Perth. But the circumstances of Muthill were exceptional, and he remained there, in a house lent him by Mr. Lendrum's brother-in-law, Dr. Clarke, from Advent 1854 till Easter 1855. Such spells of duty and occasional residences were among the most valuable instruments at his command for smoothing away difficulties and giving parochial life a new start, and this residence at Muthill was a particularly useful one as well as very satisfactory to himself.

Muthill is a pretty village, some three miles south of Crieff, in Perthshire, with the remains of an old church and an ancient tower, which are unfortunately not now (as they might easily once have been) in the hands of the Episcopal Church. The history of the congregation is an honourable one, and it is in some respects one of the strong centres of the Diocese. The following notes about it have been kindly made for me by my friend Mr. W. M. Meredith, now Incumbent of Crieff, but formerly of Muthill.

Whilst at Muthill the Bishop had a curate, Mr. Browning, to assist him in the services and in visiting. There was daily service, but it was found that those who *could* come did not, on the score of *innovation*. One old woman tells how the Bishop's daughter and Mrs. Wordsworth used to sing Psalm 100 at their week-day services.

The Bishop also re-started the Church Day School at Muthill, which Mr. Lendrum had begun, but which had apparently stopped for a time.

From the impression made we gather that he was the first Bishop of the Diocese in this century to wear the Bishop's dress. He is remembered as a good visitor, and every one speaks of his magnificent preaching, how the church was filled, and many came from a distance to hear him.

The Bishop procured for Muthill the old Font from Trinity College, Glenalmond, and to the people here he addressed his

well-known 'Plain Tract on the Scottish Communion Office,' by which he saved the use of the Office in this congregation.

The mission at Comrie (St. Fillan's) was started as an offshoot from Crieff (which was itself an offshoot from Muthill) in the Bishop's life-time; and on the other side of Muthill (in which he always continued to take a keen interest) the town of Auchterarder seemed to offer room for Church work. The Bishop and Lord Rollo went over one snowy Sunday evening and held service in a plain, bare building placed at their disposal, which was attended by some three hundred people, though no actual mission work was taken up there till many years afterwards. The Bishop, however, had the happiness of seeing the work begun, and gave it his hearty blessing. A fine church has since been built.

About the time of his residence at Muthill he began to be involved in the Eucharistic controversy, though not at first in a form that required the full exercise of his critical powers. Controversy was indeed 'in the air' in all parts of the Church of England, especially on this topic. Dr. Pusey's sermon 'On the Eucharist' was preached early in 1853.¹ In the same year, just before Whitsuntide, appeared the important book of Archdeacon Robert Isaac Wilberforce on the same subject.² In the autumn of 1853, and in the following spring, Archdeacon Denison had preached three sermons on 'Holy Communion' in Wells Cathedral, which were made the occasion of formal complaint against him. Scotland felt the stir which was thereby raised almost as much as England, at any rate throughout the Episcopal Church. Charles Wordsworth took the opportunity of a petition from some of the communicants at Meigle (pre-

¹ See *Life of Pusey*, iii. ch. xvii. *Second period of the Eucharistic Controversy*.

² He was received into the Roman Church in October 1854, but maintained to the last that his book on the Eucharist was not inconsistent with the formularies of the Church of England. His later book, *Principles of Church Authority*, undoubtedly was, and was intended to be, in opposition to them. See *Life of Pusey*, iii. 426.

sented April 1854), for the disuse of the Scottish Office, which had always been in use there, to republish his three sermons on 'Holy Communion,' preached at Glenalmond, which defined his own position without attacking that of others. They are so important, both in themselves and as an index of his mind, and have the advantage of being so uncontroversial, that the reader will benefit by the following notice of their contents and especially by the extracts of the more important passages in them.

The full title of the publication is 'Three Short Sermons on the Holy Communion considered as Sacrifice, Sacrament, and Eucharist, with notice of the differences between the Scotch and English Offices for its administration.' The preface is dated 'Muthill, Epiphany 1855,' and notes that the sermons, delivered in the autumn of 1851 at Trinity College, were now committed to the press, 'partly for reasons which concern the Author's own Diocese.' The sermons contain a statement of the doctrine under each of the three heads with a practical application. The doctrine of Sacrifice is thus connected with the duty of Repentance; that of Sacrament with the duty of Faith; that of Eucharist of course with special modes of Thankfulness. The references to the Scottish Office, which made these sermons useful in the Meikle case and elsewhere, are explained by quoting the following instruction of the Episcopal College to the Warden of Glenalmond, where the two offices were used on alternate Sundays, 'earnestly to recommend and inculcate on his pupils the propriety of their attendance on either service, the doctrine of the two Churches, though varied in expression, being confessedly one and the same.'

The statement of the doctrine of Sacrifice (p. 3) is important as a prelude to the after development of the controversy. The Lord's Supper is first treated as *an ordinance commemorative of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ.*

We are to learn, that in this holy rite Jesus Christ is not only preached by word of mouth, but by visible signs ‘openly set forth, crucified amongst us.’ We are to see in the breaking of the Bread His Body broken, and in the pouring out of the wine His Blood shed. But more than this; we are to recognise in the same divine rite all the essential properties of a true sacrifice; we are to see done in very deed what Christ did, for the remembrance of Him. And what then did He do? When the time of the Passover was fully come, He the great High Priest, the Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek, took Bread and Wine, and having sanctified them by His word and heavenly Benediction, He offered them to the Father as the representation of Himself. This action, therefore, to be adequately commemorated requires not only an offering to be made, but a Priest to offer it, and an Altar (Heb. xiii. 10) to be offered on. And this, my brethren, is the reason why the elements of Bread and Wine are first placed upon a side table (which we call the Credence or Prothesis) in order that the Priest, and no other, may solemnly present them upon the Altar as the minister of Christ, and acting in His stead.

He notes the corruption of this doctrine by the Church of Rome, since the Council of the Lateran in [1215],¹ teaching ‘that the sacrifice of the altar is not a commemoration only, but an actual repetition of the one great and all sufficient Sacrifice once made upon the Cross.’ He accounts thereby for the retrenchment of some portions of the service bearing on the doctrine of Sacrifice at the English Reformation; and describes the ‘true doctrine of a representative sacrifice’ as properly restored in the Scottish Office and ‘exhibited

¹ The date is misprinted 1245. Reference of course is to the first Canon of the Fourth Lateran Council, which contains the memorable words: ‘In qua (ecclesia) idem ipse sacerdos et sacrificium Iesus Christus; cuius corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur; transsubstantiatis, pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem, potestate divina, ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo quod accepit ipse de nostro.’ That ‘actual repetition’ is involved in this Canon may, however, reasonably be doubted.

in the clearness and integrity in which it is uniformly set forth in the Primitive Liturgies.'

The following passage sums up the first head of doctrine :

It teaches us of a death to be commemorated, by visible representation, till the end of time (1 Cor. xi. 26). It teaches us of that death as a sacrifice for sin, for the sin of the whole world. It teaches us of that sacrifice, as offered once for all by Jesus Christ, emblematically at the Paschal supper, but substantially upon the Cross; and as represented continually by His appointed Ministers who still 'do this,' or rather 'make this'—that is, make this offering—'for *the* remembrance of Him' (Luke xxii. 19). It teaches us of the offering which He made, and commanded to be repeated,¹ for a continual witness and exhibition of His precious death to the world, to the holy Angels, and above all to God, as none other than Himself; Who being from the beginning the Son of God, and so all-mighty to save, became, in order that He might die, and so accomplish our Salvation, the Son of Man (pp. 7, 8).

This doctrine is supported by quotations from Bishop Andrewes, Bishop Jolly, and St. Ambrose *de Officiis Ministrorum* (i. 48).

In the second sermon on the doctrine of Holy Communion as a Sacrament the following gives the pith of his teaching.

In the view we are now to take, we are to see the same Bread and Wine which have been offered as the symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ, first consecrated into a most holy mystery by prayer and the laying on of sacred hands, and then returned to us as from God by the same representative of Jesus Christ to be to us all that that mystery portends, and all that we ourselves had signified by the offering we had made.

¹ This must refer to the offering made at the Paschal supper, as he says above 'emblematically.' In a MS. note to p. 18 he quotes Bishop Buckeridge, *Discourse on Knuccling*, p. 52: 'Tho' there be not *idem sacrificium*, as it denoteth the action of sacrificing, yet it is *idem sacrificatum*; Christ crucified, that is, *reprsented* to God and *communicated* to us.'

Hence the Altar in this view becomes the Lord's Table and the Priest the Steward of the Lord's household. The former view presupposed a congregation of fellow worshippers with the priest, the latter a companionship of guests. 'It is odious among men for one to feast by himself alone. How much more at the Table of the God of Love.'

The careful reader will note here the phrase 'be to us all that that mystery portends,' which echoes the words of some of the old Liturgies including those of the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., and differing very slightly from the Roman form, 'ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis fiat.' It is, however, as we shall presently see, a reading into the Scottish Office of what ought to be, but is not, there. The reader will also observe the stress justly laid on the participation of 'a company of guests' to communicate with the priest, the absence of which, except on rare occasions, can only be justified by treating the service simply as a Sacrifice and not also as a Sacrament. Here we have the germs of much of the Bishop's controversial teaching in after times.

He then adds some helpful words on the topic of the relation of Sacraments generally to the Incarnation, and the virtue which they derive from the presence of Christ's manhood in them by the operation of the Holy Ghost.

Their great characteristic is that they unite us to the man's nature of Christ, Who took our life that we might partake of His; Who became the Son of Man, in order that He might give us the power to become sons of God. In this view they have been called 'the extension of the Incarnation'—that is, the channels through which the virtue and efficacy of that stupendous act of goodness and condescension on the part of the second person of the blessed Trinity (whereby our fallen nature is again renewed after the image of God) are *extended* and communicated to man. . . . Hence we conclude, that whatever efficacy the Sacraments possess they derive from hence, that the

manhood of Christ is truly present in them; and that this presence is effected by the operation of the Holy Ghost (p. 20 foll.).

This naturally leads to a commendation of the special Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Scottish Office as adopted from the ancient Liturgies, in favour of which Bishop Short of St. Asaph and Bishop Wilson of Man are quoted. Finally, he does not scruple to call the sacramental presence of Christ ‘a *real*, and in some sense a *bodily Presence* of Christ with all who worthily receive Him in these Holy mysteries.’ In a note to this passage he shows that the Primitive Church did not hold the modern Roman doctrine of the bodily presence, by referring to ‘the illustration which the Fathers derived from the union of the two parts of the Sacrament, to confute the heresy of Eutyches, who denied the union of the two natures in the one Person of Christ.’¹ In another he quotes Bishop Andrewes as testifying that unworthy Communicants receive to no purpose—a tacit reference to the controversy raised by Archdeacon Denison.

The words which follow on the consequent duty are worth quoting:

As a necessary consequence of the doctrine of Sacramental Communion in the Lord’s Supper we require faith. To possess faith we require to cultivate habits of holiness. We require charity which gives a single eye; we require temperance which gives a single heart; an eye to discern Christ in these holy mysteries, and a heart to love Him, and not only Him, but our neighbour also for His sake. [Then follows a warning not to consider forms of devotional preparation as by themselves sufficient.] . . . Unless at the same time you are honestly

¹ The heresy of Eutyches was what is generally called monophysite, teaching that the human nature was absorbed by, if not wholly lost in, the divine. In the Sacrament, as in the Person of Jesus Christ, both the divine and the human characters coexist.

striving, watching, praying day by day to form in yourself the habits which I have named, and which a man can no more put on and off for the occasion than he can change at a wish the height of his stature or the colour of his skin (p. 28).

In the third sermon there is an animated passage based on the language of Ps. cxvi. showing how much the Christian's reasons for Eucharistic thankfulness exceed those of the Jew. It ends thus, and is interesting because of its reference to our Lord's continual High Priesthood—as far at any rate as this offering is concerned :

If a Jew in thankful acknowledgment of the benefits he had enjoyed, could solemnly promise 'I will offer to Thee the sacrifice of thanksgiving; I will pay my vows unto the Lord in the sight of all His people, in the courts of the Lord's house, even in the midst of thee, O Jerusalem'; how much more is the Christian called upon to promise and to pay the same, who has a great High Priest, even Jesus the Son of God, to present his offering, and who through Him is admitted into the courts above, into the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and is joined in presenting the same offering by an innumerable company of Angels, and by the general Assembly and Church, living and departed, gathered not from the Jews only, but out of every nation and kindred of the earth! (p. 34 foll.).

The consequent teaching on thanksgiving by word, by alms, by offering of the creatures to the Lord of creatures, and in the act of Communion, may readily be imagined by the thoughtful reader. More striking perhaps still, is the quotation from Isaac Williams¹ to illustrate the value of the humble and penitential character of the English and Scottish Offices. The sermon ends with a recommendation of the practice of weekly Communion, made, we must remember, originally to boys, by one who had great experience as a master of what they were capable.

Of these sermons I do not think I shall do wrong in

¹ *Sermons on the Catechism*, ii. 289, 290.

saying that they are even now very valuable as an exposition of what is the general Anglican position, and that it would be difficult to find it better stated in the same compass. For general use in England they are, perhaps, a little unsuited on account of the frequent references in them to the Scottish Office, in defence and illustration of which they were partly written. The position of that Office, and Bishop Wordsworth's attitude to it, are, however, so important, both in themselves and as illustrative of his policy as a Bishop, that the reader will desire to have a general summary in this place of what is necessary for him to know about the matter. The publication of the 'Three Sermons' at this time was, as I have said, with special reference to the petition from Meigle, but the author tells us in his 'Annals' that during the first four or five years of his Episcopate he received applications to sanction the partial or entire abandonment of the Scottish Office in favour of the English, not only from Meigle, but from Alyth (close to Meigle), Muthill, Forfar, Strath-tay and Blairgowrie. This movement he resisted to the best of his power, making special efforts at Meigle and Muthill, but with very little success, except (as we have seen) at the latter place. The statistics given by him in his Charge of 1862 (p. 8) record that between that date and 1844 the Scottish Office had (more or less entirely) been lost in *ten* congregations, while it had been freshly adopted only by *three*.

The fact of course is, that the Scottish Office, which is in many respects beautiful and affecting, and which is known by careful students to have a distinctly non-Roman colour, requires not a little liturgical culture for its appreciation. It has, moreover, one crucial point of special difficulty, and its order is very strange to an Englishman. The latter point strikes the most careless worshipper, who observes

that the Consecration Prayers are much longer than the English, and that they come *before* the prayer for the 'whole state of Christ's Church,' so that a long interval occurs between Consecration and Communion. But when he looks more deeply into the Consecration Prayer he observes in it an abrupt and startling formula, for which no precedent can be found in any Liturgy, ancient or modern. After the recitation of the words and acts of the Institution occurs an oblation, and then an invocation after the manner of the Eastern Liturgies in the following terms : 'Vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with Thy word and Holy Spirit, these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they *may become the body and blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son*. And we earnestly desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, &c.' Now, as we have seen, there is much to recommend to us this general form of invocation. But when we learn that the abrupt expression of its design (*may become . . . Son*), without any qualification following, or any specification of the persons for whose use, or the purposes for which, this great mysterious change is intended, was only introduced in this form by Bishop Wm. Falconar, of Moray, and Bishop Robert Forbes, of Ross, in 1764, and that it differs in this abruptness not only from the first book of Edward VI. (1549), and from the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, but from the Western and Oriental Liturgies of every age and country, we cannot be surprised at the adverse criticism to which it has been subjected. The point does not lie in the word *become*, but in the fact that it is unscriptural¹ and contrary to all precedent to omit

¹ Our Lord's words clearly define the purpose of the Sacrament, and it is by them that we must justify the insistence of our Church upon the *due use* of the Sacrament, and her refusal (at least in England) to sanction reservation because of its misuse in local restriction of Christ's presence to the Tabernacle or Monstrance. There can be no mistake about the emphasis, 'This is my

reference to the covenant relation which the Lord from the first stamped upon His ordinance. This relation was well brought out in the Prayer Book of 1549:

Hear us (O merciful Father) we beseech Thee: and with Thy holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine *that they may be unto us* the body and blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ. Who in the same night, &c.

and in the first Scottish Liturgy of 1637:

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee, and of Thy Almighty goodness, vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with Thy word and holy Spirit these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, *that they may be unto us* the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly-beloved Son; *so that we receiving them* according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion *may be partakers of the same His most precious Body and Blood*: who in the night, &c.

The Bishop of St. Andrews did not at first observe this latter point. In his 'Three Short Sermons,' p. 23, he treats the form of Consecration as 'substantially the same in both' the English and the Scottish Offices. On the other hand, in his 'Plain Tract on the Scotch Communion Office,' which was delivered as an address to the Congre-

Body *which is given for you* (Luke xxii. 19, R. V.); 'This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many unto remission of sins' (Matt. xxvi. 28, R. V.); or, 'This cup is *the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you*' (Luke xxii. 20, R. V., ep. 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25, *which is for you, and the new covenant in my blood*, R. V.). On the alteration of 1764, see Bishop John Dowden, of Edinburgh, *The Annotated Scottish Communion Office*, Appendix L, p. 339, Edinb. 1884. The revisers supposed themselves to be following the Clementine Liturgy; but (1) that Liturgy was not, as far as we know, in use anywhere, and (2) after the clause praying that the Holy Spirit may make or show (*ἀποφύνη*) the bread the Body of Christ, and the cup His Blood, it immediately proceeds, 'so that those who partake of it may be confirmed in godliness, may obtain remission of sins,' &c., which is orthodox enough.

gation at Muthill, March 20, 1859, and had the effect of confirming the congregation there in their old attachment to the Office, he touches directly upon the disputed point. He explains 'become' as equivalent to 'come to be,' and defends the whole expression as no more open to the charge of teaching transubstantiation than our Lord's own words, 'This is my body,' while the Church in Article xxviii. explicitly rejects that doctrine. But three years later, in September 1862, on further consideration, and probably after arriving at a more detailed knowledge of the historical facts, he was clearly of opinion that this particular expression was open to reasonable objection and required alteration. He observes in his Charge addressed to the Synod of that year that one of their body [Rev. G. H. Forbes, brother of the Bishop of Brechin] proposed to meet the difficulty by adding the following words drawn from the Liturgy of St. James: 'for the forgiveness of our sins, for our growth in grace, for the bringing forth of good works, and for obtaining life everlasting'; and notes that a similar modification had since been suggested both by Mr. Freeman and Mr. Keble.

He then further proposed (p. 22) :

1. That the Consecration Prayer in the Scotch Office be reconsidered, more especially with a view of altering the phrase 'may become' &c. &c.

2. That the Prayer, when altered, be accepted by the Church as a duplicate formula, together with the Consecration Prayer in the English Office; as we already have duplicate forms of collects for the Easter weeks, for the Sovereign (after the commandments), &c. &c.

3. That the use of this duplicate formula be subject to canonical regulation, upon these or similar terms: 'It shall be lawful for the priest to introduce it, at his discretion, provided its use shall be desired by not less than two-thirds of the male adult Communicants. This rule to apply to all congregations.'

This proposal was made in consequence of the discussion at the General Synod held in July 1862, and continued by successive adjournments to 13 February, 1863, which ended, however, in an unfortunate conclusion. The text of the Office remained unaltered, but it was removed from its position of 'primary authority.' The English Book of Common Prayer was adopted as the service book of the Church, and the use of its Communion office enjoined at all Consecrations, Ordinations, and Synods. Difficult conditions were laid down as to the introduction of the Scottish Office into new congregations, while (arguing *ex silentio*) it could not be introduced into old ones where it was not already in use. Its continuance where it was in use was tolerated, but it might be removed by a concurrence of the clergyman and a majority of the Communicants.

This somewhat harsh treatment of an old and much loved formula was partly due to a wish to conciliate English prejudice, as negotiations were then going on for a removal of the disabilities of Scottish clergy in England,¹ partly to the growth in power of the Southern Dioceses, which were, generally speaking, against the Office, in opposition to the old pre-eminence of the North. It was vehemently resisted by G. H. Forbes of Burntisland, who protested against the competence of the General Synod to legislate on such a matter, and carried his protest after a time by appeal into the House of Lords—but naturally in vain.

Bishop Wordsworth recurred to the subject by re-

¹ These were carried to a successful issue by the Duke of Buccleuch, and others, in 1864, 27 & 28 Vict. c. 94. As to the views of the Anglicising party, the reader may consult a printed letter of Bishop Ewing, of Glasgow, to Primus Terrot, dated Bishopston, 1 May, 1858 (Grant, Edinburgh), in which he urges 'uniformity and, if possible, incorporation with the Church of England' (p. 17, proposed resolution at a General Synod). He was an uncompromising opponent of the Scottish Office, ascribing the misfortunes of the Eucharistic Controversy mainly to it.

printing his Charge of 1862, with other matter, as a contribution to the Seabury Commemoration in 1884—under the title ‘English, Scotch, and American Communion Offices.’ His last printed utterance upon it was in his Charge of 1889, in connection with the last General Synod, when he suggested the substitution of the form used by the Old Catholics in Germany and Switzerland—proposed, if I recollect rightly, in that community by my friend Bishop Edward Herzog, of Berne—‘may be the Communion of the Body and Blood.’ But the matter was shelved.

When revision takes place, if a forecast may be hazarded, it will probably follow the precedents of 1549 and 1637 in reading ‘may be unto us.’ The formula ‘may become unto us’ would have one peculiar feature, which might seem of value, and might be held to avoid certain difficulties, viz. that of literal agreement with the words of the Roman Canon Missae. But then the difference of the Scottish Office from the Roman, in that it places the Invocation *after* the words of Institution, is so marked, that this literal agreement in phrase, so dislocated, would have really the opposite effect. It would emphasise the thought that consecration was not effected by the words of Institution, but by the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, which to some might be welcome and to others much the reverse. Altogether, the matter is much less simple than it might appear, and I am not surprised that the General Synod thought it wisest to leave it alone. But some day I should venture to hope that the Scottish Church will return, as regards the consecration prayer, to the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., which is in this order: first Invocation, then Institution, then Oblation, the prayer of the Invocation being in the form ‘may be unto us.’¹ This would bring the Office into closer union both with the East and the West, and with

¹ This, I imagine, was intended to be a version of ‘ut fiat nobis.’

our own Church in the first and most learned period of its liturgical efforts, and substantially too with the Old Catholics. I do not myself, as a student of Liturgies, believe that the relative position of these different parts of the prayer of consecration is very important in itself, or that the presence of any particular one of them was, according to primitive usage, considered to be absolutely necessary. I have considered the evidence on this subject at some length in a book on 'The Holy Communion.'¹ But as a Bishop of the Church, and as interested in the question of Reunion, I feel very strongly that anything which makes for external agreement is of the greatest possible practical importance: and that the Scottish Office as it stands is unnecessarily angular.

I do not think that I can conclude this subject better than by giving the reader the Bishop of St. Andrews' own words in which he sums up his final judgment on the Scottish Office taken from his last note-books.²

1. I cannot pretend to be an enthusiastic admirer of the S. C. Office. Still less can I join in ascribing any exorbitant share of merit to our Scotch Church in regard to it. The feature which gives to it its distinctive value—viz. the Invocation—was derived from the first English Reformed Prayer Book.³

2. In regard to the Office itself, in my opinion the praise has been extravagant, and the blame has been extravagant. If we are to follow the guidance and the records of antiquity (as we claim to follow them in other matters), it would seem desirable to have a form of Consecration more full than that of the English Office, including a more formal presentation of the elements and a direct invocation of the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, we cannot suppose that the simpler scriptural record which the English Office is content to follow is insufficient. There seems

¹ Pages 132-152, ed. 2, 1892.

² *MS. Note-books*, iii. 38, v. 6, 7, 21.

³ See Neale's *Life of Bishop Torry*, pp. 209 and 316, for the Bishop's opinion on this point.

little room for extravagant feeling on either side, and still less for vaunting and contending for the S. O. as a badge of nationality, considering that the sources from which it was immediately derived were mainly English, and little can be pleaded as Scotch except the unhappy alteration of 1764 in the Consecration Prayer, which the American Church has wisely avoided; and no less wisely, in my opinion, has preferred the English Order in the arrangement of the several parts of the service. I have no sympathy with the frame of mind which would magnify matters of that sort into the importance of fundamental verities and would expose the Church to continual turmoil and dissension on their account. There was nothing in our Lord's conduct upon earth to indicate a desire to lay stress upon such formalities, but much to the contrary.

3. In my opinion the Church will not be doing right, or acting fairly by its members as a whole, if it consents to alter the present canon without an alteration in the Office itself. It is idle and untrue to allege the example and authority of our Brethren in America in behalf of the Office until we have done what they have had the wisdom to do by altering the phrase introduced unadvisedly and with no Synodal Authority in 1764, which gave reasonable offence, and rather takes from than adds to the real value of the Office.

After leaving Muthill the Wordsworths removed, at Whitsuntide 1855, to Birnam Cottage, just outside Dunkeld, near where the present Bishop for a time resided. It was in a beautiful, but rather relaxing situation on the banks of the Tay. The Bishop's work here no doubt led greatly to the growth of the Church in Dunkeld in after years. The congregation then met in an upper room over a stable, but in June 1857 he had the happiness of seeing the first stone of the present excellent church laid.

The Synod of 1855 was held at Perth on 28 August, the chief subjects discussed being the 'Diocesan Association for Church Purposes,' the practice of Baptism by immersion, which was insisted upon by Mr. G. H. Forbes contrary to

the Bishop's judgment, and the admission of Irvingites to Communion. The Diocesan Association was a large scheme, but one of its objects, the endowment of the Bishopric to the extent of fully £500 a year, was attained chiefly by the energy of Lord Rollo, the Bishop's constant friend and ever ready host.

The family were driven from Birnam Cottage by sickness, and spent the winter, as was often the case, in visits to Burghelere and Winchester, while the Bishop composed his lectures on 'Unity and the Christian Ministry,' which were delivered next year with considerable success at Edinburgh, Forfar, Perth, and St. Andrews. These lectures were never published, but large portions were used in his 'Outlines of the Christian Ministry,' published in 1872.

The Bishop left Birnam Cottage shortly after Easter 1856 (April 1), and about Whitsuntide took up his abode at Pitcullen Bank, on the East of Perth, which was his home till the spring of 1858. He had been longing for a home for some three years, and wrote in his pocket almanack at Birnam: '*When wilt thou come unto me? I will walk in my house with a perfect heart.*' These years had been years of considerable anxiety and discomfort, which he bore with his usual faith and patience. He was now able to have his family again about him, a society in which he took great delight, and to enjoy once more the use of his valuable library, of which he had been deprived for this period. The Synod and Visitation were held at St. Ninian's 26 and 27 August, and appear to have been of a very satisfactory character to all present. The Charge, like that of the previous year, contributed materials to the 'Outlines of the Christian Ministry.' At this point the 'Annals' unfortunately cease.

It should be noticed that in this year (October 1856) the question of the relation of Trinity College to the Church

was finally settled. 'The College was dissevered from the Diocese of St. Andrews and made a *Peculiar* under the jurisdiction of the College of Bishops, the Bishop of St. Andrews still consenting to hold the necessary Confirmations when requested by the Warden.'¹

In the same year the Bishop reprinted an article which he had contributed to the 'Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal' under the title of 'Papal Aggression in the East; or, the Protestantism of the Oriental Church,' which contains some valuable extracts from the answer of the Patriarchs of the East to the Letter of Pius IX. of 1848. The Oriental letter was sent to him by Mr. Wm. Palmer. The reason for this publication at this time was the existence of rumours of the establishment of Roman Catholic Dioceses and Bishops in Scotland: an event long in contemplation which actually took place in 1877.

As the next chapter is occupied chiefly with controversy, I may mention here that in October 1858 the Bishop moved into his final home at Perth, the Feu House, of which he took a lease of nineteen years. He made it a delightful residence. He had, I may remark, great taste in architecture and in the laying out of grounds and gardens, the result of which is now conspicuous at Glenalmond. He thought it necessary to plan a terrace walk wherever he made his abode—a predilection which other members of the family, beginning with William Wordsworth, and including my father, have shared with him. At the Feu a broad walk of smooth-mown turf, which he designed, under overshadowing trees, was his constant resort for a daily 'constitutional.' To a man of his temperament these plans and improvements were a great relief in the midst of the controversies which we have now to describe.

¹ See Gordon's *Scotchchronicon*, vi. 395.

CHAPTER IV.

THE EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY AND ST. NINIAN'S. 1857-1860.

'The truth exploring with an equal mind,
 In doctrine and communion they have sought
 Firmly between the two extremes to steer;
 But theirs the wise man's ordinary lot,
 To trace right courses for the stubborn blind,
 And prophesy to ears that will not hear.'

WM. WORDSWORTH'S *Eecl. Sonnets*, pt. ii. 40.¹

The Eucharistic controversy—Bishop Forbes's Primary Charge (August 1857)—Its connection with the controversy in England—Previous works of Pusey and Keble—Summary of Forbes's Charge: the Presence, Adoration, Sacrifice; Scottish Office—Part taken by Bishop of St. Andrews reserved and laborious, and tending to united action—The Charge discussed in the Episcopal Synod—Agitation—Three Bishops' Declaration—Clerical and Lay Addresses—Keble's Letter to the Primus—Publication of Mr. Cheyne's 'Six Sermons' (February 1858) prevents a settlement—Their aggressive character—Presented to Bishop Suther: his attempted restriction—Synodal Letter of 27 May, 1858, drafted by Bishop of St. Andrews and signed by all but Bishop Forbes—Comments on it—The Bishop's explanatory letter to Sir A. Edmonstone—R. Palmer's 'Opinion'—Bishop Trower's 'Pastoral'—Keble's 'Considerations'—Mr. Cheyne suspended at Aberdeen (August 1858)—Bishop of St. Andrews' 'Notes on the Eucharistic Controversy': summary of them—Pacific Charge of 1858—Mr. Cheyne's first appeal—Death of Rev. Wm. B. Barter—His character—Mr. Cheyne's obstinacy—His second trial (May 1859), appeal, and sentence (November 1859)—His restoration (1863).

Rupture between the Bishop and the Chapter of St. Ninian's—History of their relations—Bishop's view of his position in the Cathedral—Mr. D. Chambers's 'Opinion'—Perth Cathedral School—Announces his withdrawal (May 1859)—More outspoken Charge of September, 1859—Eastward Position given up—Pamphlets of Mr. Humble and Mr. Lendrum.

¹ I have chosen this motto as one which applies generally to the subject of this memoir, not as thinking that truth lay *absolutely* on his side. My own judgment is given at the end of the chapter.

Legal proceedings against Bishop Forbes (October 1859)—His 'Letter to the Congregation of St. Paul's, Dundee'—Anonymous 'Proposals for Peace,' by Bishop of St. Andrews—Language of Anglican and Scottish Divines—Further proceedings—Interview with Keble (8 February, 1860)—Judgment in the case (15 March, 1860).

The Bishop of St. Andrews' own remarks—Painful circumstances—George Forbes's approval of his 'Opinion'—The chief questions at issue: Is there a Real Presence on the altar 'in' the consecrated elements, and a Sacrifice identical with the Sacrifice of the Cross?—Criticism of this position from Scripture and antiquity—Quotation from his 'Opinion' on the Melchizedekian Priesthood.

The writer's own judgment—Disturbance of the proportion of faith in the doctrine of the adoration of Christ 'in the gifts'—Danger of pressing logic to extremes—Our ignorance of the conditions of Christ's existence in the unseen world—Equal difficulties of a 'presence of virtue and efficacy' and of a 'supra-local presence'—The writer inclined to the theory of Sacrifice which regards the Church on Earth as uniting with our Lord in Heaven—Scripture again teaches a distinction between different modes of our Lord's Presence—Forbes passes from the Sacrifice of the Cross to the Sacrifice of the Upper Room without seeing the difference between them—The Church repeats the second, but not the first.

The Principalship of St Andrews desired for the Bishop.

IN the summer of 1857 Bishop Alexander Penrose Forbes, of Brechin, delivered his *Primary Charge*, which introduced¹ the Eucharistic controversy in a somewhat acute form into Scotland. As the subject of this memoir devoted a great part of his time and strength for several years to the scrutiny of this Charge, and to the parallel utterances of Mr. Patrick Cheyne, which were unfortunately entangled

¹ It is true that five of the Rev. Patrick Cheyne's *Six Sermons on the Doctrine of the most Holy Eucharist* were delivered in Lent, 1857, at St. John the Evangelist's, Aberdeen, and may have caused some local stir at the time. But they were not published till the spring of the next year. The preface is dated Septuagesima 1858; and, therefore, they were practically later than the Charge, and one of them is partly based upon it. In discussing the controversies reviewed in this chapter I have used particularly two volumes of pamphlets &c., thirty-five altogether in number, lent to me by the kindness of their collector, Rev. J. W. Hunter, of Birnam, some of which must be very scarce. I have also three volumes of my own, containing thirty-two pamphlets, which were, I imagine, the property of Rev. Henry Aubrey, at one time Chaplain to the Earl of Morton, but lately beneficed near Salisbury. Fourteen of these are elsewhere unknown to me, making up forty-nine in all. I have also referred, of course, to Liddon's *Life of*

with it, it is necessary for us to review both the Charge itself and the criticism to which it was subjected, particularly by the Bishop of St. Andrews. In the discharge of this task I shall have no temptation to partisanship, as I had a sincere admiration and affection for Bishop Forbes, whose little Bible, used by him with noble dutifulness during the cholera at Dundee, is one of my cherished possessions. I shall attempt faithfully to represent the opinions and arguments of both sides, and shall also (as in regard to other controversies described in this volume) endeavour to help the reader to form a judgment for himself. For, as I have before remarked, no one is likely to read this book, except he be really interested in the questions discussed in it, as well as in the outward life of its principal subject.

It was on Wednesday, 7 August, 1857, that Bishop Forbes delivered his first Charge at the Synod of the clergy of his Diocese held in the little city of Brechin. He had been Bishop nearly ten years, but was still a young man, just turned forty,¹ and, perhaps, partly for that reason he had hitherto shrunk from addressing the clergy in this formal manner. He tells us, at any rate, in the opening sentences, that such was the case, and that it was only on an occasion when he felt called upon to say something that he broke in upon the reserve which he had hitherto imposed upon himself (p. 5). The occasion was, no doubt, afforded him by the controversy which had some time been going on in England. Archdeacon Denison's case had broken down in the Archbishop's Court, the Court of Arches, on a technical point (23 April, 1857) ; but, though *Pusey*, iii. chap. xviii., 'Second Period of Eucharistic Controversy,' and to Ross's *Memoir of Alexander Ewing* and to Mackey's *Bishop Forbes, &c.* The latter is a poor book, but has some useful documents. My uncle has left some MS. notes on the subject, but they are not as full as could be wished. But I have used a complete collection of his printed papers belonging to his family.

¹ He was born 6 June, 1817, and consecrated Bishop 28 October, 1847.

it was dismissed there, the question was still, in some degree, subject to appeal, and the appeal lay to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Bishop Forbes refers slightly, and perhaps a little harshly, to the circumstances of this case in the first division of this Charge (pp. 12, 13), but no doubt he represented the feelings and anxieties of many in England at this time. His two friends, Dr. Pusey and Mr. Keble, had, both of them, lately been engaged upon treatises dealing with special aspects of the same controversy, which saw the light somewhat before his own Charge. Dr. Pusey wrote his dry but laborious book,¹ the preface to which is dated 'Christ Church, Easter 1857,' entitled 'The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Doctrine of the English Church,' in order to show in detail that his Eucharistic teaching was consistent with honest subscription to the formularies of the Church of England.² Mr. Keble's contribution was of a different nature—his treatise, 'On Eucharistical Adoration'—which has many elements of beauty and attractiveness, but fails somewhat in strength of argument. In regard to this treatise a good critic³ specially instances the commentary on the title 'Son of Man' (pp. 31–56) as, beyond question, the most valuable portion of the essay. A certain weakness

¹ Dr. Pusey had already published three collections of passages bearing on the subject:—(1) At the end of his sermon of 1843, *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent*, from English divines; (2) *The Doctrine of the Real Presence, as set forth in the Works of Divines and others of the English Church from the Reformation*, part i., Oxford, 1855 (advertisement dated London, January 11, 1855); (3) *The Doctrine of the Real Presence as contained in the Fathers from the Death of St. John the Evangelist to the Fourth General Council, vindicated in Notes on a Sermon, 'The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist,'* preached in 1853 (Oxford, 1855; a volume of 722 pp. dated, at the end, Thursday in Holy Week). It was this last volume that was so laboriously attacked by Dr. John Harrison in 1871.

² See Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, iii. 447, and the whole chapter.

³ Dr. H. P. Liddon, in his notice of the Treatise in the *Christian Remembrancer* for January, 1858, xxxv. 235.

is evident in the more argumentative parts, e.g. in those that refer to the practice of bowing at the name of Jesus (as based on Philippians ii. 10). In one particular, indeed, Keble goes further than Forbes, when he says: 'I must take leave to say that, granting the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, Adoration is not only permitted, but enjoined by the Church of England in her Prayer Book: those who would prove that she prohibits the one must first make out that she denies the other; which they can never do as long as her Catechism and her Communion office remain' (p. 130). The logic of this passage leaves much to be desired. It would seem to make the absence of prohibition equivalent to positive injunction. But the treatise, read cautiously, has much that is fruitful in it.

In chivalrous and warm-hearted co-operation with these two friends Bishop Forbes composed his first official deliverance¹ on a great theological subject. He wished to help them and their cause; he wished also, but as a subordinate object, to defend the Scottish Office, which, as we have seen, was then subject to much attack, owing particularly to the agitation for the removal of the disabilities of the Scottish clergy. His Charge, however, is chiefly occupied with the four questions then debated in England—the doctrine of the Presence, the reception by the wicked, Eucharistic Adoration, and the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The Charge is, in fact, a theological treatise on a small scale (pp. 5–42) on these four points, with an appendix, so to call it, on the Scottish Office (pp. 42–48). I shall enumerate the principal topics as they stand, with special emphasis on those expressions concerning them which were most subject to criticism.

Section 1 (pp. 6–26) deals with the 'Real Presence.'

¹ He had published in 1852 his *Short Explanation of the Nicene Creed*, written at the suggestion of Dr. Pusey.

The question is said to be, 'Is [Christ] Himself, according to His own word, really present in the Holy Sacrament, as the supernatural Bread which cometh down from Heaven; the strengthening and refreshing of the weary soul of man during his pilgrimage here? . . . Is the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper the partaking of the Living Christ, or merely the memorial of the Dead?' In examining the sense of our formularies on this question, he first states that the Articles are conditions of clerical admission to ministry, not creeds, and then shows what other authorities have to be taken into consideration by loyal Churchmen. There is a fivefold test to be supplied:—(1) The Articles and Catechism; (2) the whole language of prayer; (3) exhortations, rubrics and directions; (4) Fathers and decrees of Councils; (5) Holy Scripture—not 'development.' These are applied in turn. Under (1) is quoted my predecessor, Bishop Geste's letter (as Bishop of Rochester), dated December 22, 1566, to Sir William Cecil, on the 29th Article (of which he claims the authorship), in which he explains the words of the Article, 'after an heavenly and spirituall maner onely,' as not excluding 'the presence of Christ's body from the Sacrament, but only the grossenes and sensiblenes in the receavinge thereof' (p. 15).¹ The patristic interpretation of Scripture occupies considerable space. Then follows a just enough criticism of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and another, very superficial, of the 'rationalistic theory

¹ With this letter should be compared another printed (in part) for the first time by Mr. Wm. Goode (afterwards Dean of Ripon) in *A Supplement to his work on the Eucharist*, pp. 8 foll. (London, 1858). In it Geste suggests to Lord Burleigh (probably in May 1571) that it would be best for the Bishop of Gloucester (Cheney), who was then under censure, that the word 'only' should be put out of the Book of Articles, which was then in Burleigh's hands to put before the Queen. He objects, also, strongly to the 29th Article, *on the wicked*, &c.: and wishes to add the word 'profitably' in the previous Article, so that it should run '[But] the mean whereby the Body of Christ is *profitably* received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.'

of the presence which makes it one of power and efficacy only,' with a further disparaging reference to 'the nonjuring Catechisms.'¹ These hasty expressions naturally gave great offence, though the Bishop professed to speak 'with great reserve and tenderness.' For these expressions seemed to be an indictment, at least constructively, of a very large body of divines, both in England and Scotland, some of them of the highest reputation—beginning with Hooker and ending with the authors of the usual Scottish Episcopalian Catechisms, and the Bishop's own father, Lord Medwyn, all of whom had used the terms, 'virtue and efficacy,' 'power and effect,' &c. to explain the mystery of Christ's Presence. This passage was, therefore, somewhat enlarged in the third

¹ The reader will naturally compare Forbes's remarks on this point with the fuller and more sympathetic treatment of the topic by Keble, the editor of Hooker, to whose *Ecclesiastical Polity*, I suppose, is chiefly due the prevalence of this opinion in the Church of England (*Euch. Ad.* chap. iv. § 3, 124). Keble himself had, of course, also given currency to it in his *Christian Year* 'Gunpowder Treason'—

' O come to our Communion Feast :
There present, in the heart,
Not in the hands, th' eternal Priest
Will His true self impart.'

The *Not*, as is well known, was afterwards changed by his permission, given on his death-bed, to *As*, but neither seems very appropriate. Christ's presence as an eternal Priest is, strictly speaking, neither *in* the heart nor *in* the hands. We might say justly enough 'to the heart *Through* reverent hands,' i.e. of both the minister and the communicant. I do not wonder that Keble was reluctant to make the alteration, because he was speaking of the presence of the 'eternal Priest' rather than of His body apart from Him; and though he might not be satisfied with the first wording of his poem, he could hardly, as a poet and as a theologian desiring to give a clear conception, have approved of the last. The presence of 'power and efficacy' was the doctrine not only of Hooker, but of Ken (see *Works*, iv. 84 and 120) and Wilson, not to speak of Jeremy Taylor, of the famous Scottish Bishops Rattray and Jolly, and of later Bishops, long after the time of the non-jurors. See [Bishop of St. Andrews'] *Proposals for Peace*, passim, and *The Recent Decision of the Episcopal Synod of the Church in Scotland*, by a Presbyter (Edin. 1859), being four articles from the *English Churchman*, especially pp. 4-6 and 18.

edition (pp. 19 foll.), but without any concession as to the possible orthodoxy of those who were thus censured.

Section II. (26–29) concerns *the reception by the wicked*, on which Pusey and Keble somewhat differed. It does not appear to need much comment. The conclusion is, ‘We may not speculate on these things; it is enough to believe that in some sense the wicked do receive CHRIST indeed, to their condemnation and loss, for thus and thus only can they become guilty of the Body and Blood of CHRIST.’ He has previously noticed that the words quoted in Article xxix. as St. Augustine’s are not really his, but those of the Venerable Bede commenting on Augustine. The point, however, is overlooked that the Article says, in its own language, ‘in no wise are they partakers of Christ.’ This surely required his phrase to be modified.

Sections III. (29–35), on *Eucharistic Adoration*, and IV. (35–42), on *the doctrine of the Christian Sacrifice*, contain the passages which were most subject to remark and criticism. In III. the duty of adoration is logically deduced from acceptance of the Presence.

If the Body and the Blood of Christ be there really [i.e. in the Sacrament] (inasmuch as the Humanity of our Lord hypostatically united to the Divinity is itself an object of worship) it follows that supreme adoration is due to the Body and Blood of CHRIST mysteriously present in the gifts, which yet retain their own substance. The worship is due not to the gifts, but to Christ in the gifts, and this seems to be what Bishop Andrewes meant when he says ‘CHRIST the inward part of the Sacrament, in the Sacrament, and out of the Sacrament, wheresoever He is, is to be worshipped’;¹ and our own great theologian, Bishop William Forbes,² of Edinburgh, quoting the Bishop of Spalatro,³ says: ‘Christ in the Eucharist is to be adored with divine worship,

¹ *Ad Card. Bellarmin. resp.* 195, 266, Anglo-Cath. Lib.

² *Forbesii Considerationes Modestae*, p. 545, Anglo-Cath. Lib. Several paragraphs are quoted at length in the note.

³ That is to say, Marco Antonio De Dominis, who for a time resided in

as His living and glorified Body is present therein.' . . . It seems to be a logical necessity. Either CHRIST is present, or He is not. If He is, He ought to be adored; if He is not, *cadit quæstio*.

Forbes then proceeds to clear this doctrine from certain extreme results (p. 31 foll.). It does not imply acceptance of 'the ceremonies of the festival of Corpus Christi or of the forty hours' adoration.' The words of the Article 'the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance . . . worshipped' may still be accepted.

Our Lord ordained the Sacrament to be the perpetual application of His Sacrifice and to be the means of Union with Him. He did not ordain it to be a Palladium to confine His Presence to certain local bounds. Historically, we find evidence of the reservation of the Sacrament in the very earliest times for the purpose of communicating the sick. The reservation for the purpose of adoration was much later.

This is a valuable passage which may be commended to the notice of any amongst ourselves who favour the introduction of the modern Roman Service of Benediction with the reserved Sacrament.

He then goes on to argue that the Declaration on Kneeling at the end of the Communion office, on which many arguments had been founded, condemns the Lutheran error of ubiquitism and enunciates St. Thomas Aquinas' doctrine of the supra-local nature of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament (p. 32, cp. p. 10), a somewhat bold incursion into his opponents' ground, but not wholly without justification. He also notices, with more evident reason,¹ the

England as an English Churchman, and took part in some of our Episcopal consecrations, but afterwards reverted to Rome.

¹ The reader may be reminded that this 'black rubric,' as it is sometimes called, which is really in its origin a declaration or explanation added to some copies of the rare Second Prayer Book of Edward VI., was not part of the Prayer Book in the following reigns of Elizabeth, James I. and

change made in the wording of this document at the last revision from *Real and Essential* to 'Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood.' He implies that while we do not adore the *Corporal* Presence, we certainly do not deny the *Real and Essential* Presence.¹

Another argument which found favour with Bishop Forbes is that drawn from the alteration in the position of the 'Gloria in Excelsis' from the beginning to the end of the service, after the consecration and before the consumption of what remains of the gifts. The suggestion that it favours Eucharistic adoration in virtue of the phrase, 'O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us!' was afterwards withdrawn by Forbes himself (see p. 135). It is probable that the Reformers placed the 'Gloria' where it is, in order to make the early part of the service, which was and is often used without Communion, less festal, and to reserve this great thanksgiving for occasions when Communion had actually taken place. The Lutheran plan of using the 'Gloria in Excelsis,' even when there is no Communion, is hardly satisfactory.

He draws an argument also in favour of adoration from the custom among us that the priest receives kneeling, whereas in the older rites he stands, as in Primitive times it was customary for all communicants to do. Certainly reception by the priest kneeling is a good custom of the Church, both in England and Scotland, being enjoined by

Charles I., and was only restored in that of Charles II. in the modified form above indicated. The alteration acquires more importance when it is seen to have been, presumably at least, a condition of the restoration of the document. Thus C. Wheatley, in his well-known book, *On the Common Prayer*, draws attention to the change, and quotes the Catechism and Homilies as showing the belief of the Church of England in the Real Presence.

¹ He does not use the term 'objective presence' in this section, but in the next, p. 40.

Bishop Andrewes and Bishop William Forbes of Edinburgh.¹ But the most natural interpretation of it seems to me to be that he thereby recognises and adores the Presence of the invisible High Priest and King, Who ministers the Sacrament to him, and afterwards by him to the people, rather than that he is then adoring His Presence *in* the gifts.

In IV. we have a discussion of the *Doctrine of Sacrifice*. This section is largely occupied with quotations, in the midst of which occurs the sentence which was made part of the charge against him (p. 38): 'Moreover the ancient doctors teach that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is the same substantially with that of the Cross (Chrys. "In Heb. Hom." xvii. 3, St. Greg. "Dial." iv. 58), and that Jesus Christ Himself is the chief and principal minister of the Eucharistic Sacrifice (St. Ambrose "de bened. Patr." c. ix., "In Ps." 38, n. 25; St. Chrys. "Prod. Jud." i. 6; "2 Tim. Hom." ii. 4; St. Aug. "Civ. Dei," x. 20)'—St. Ambrose and St. Augustine being quoted at length at the foot of the page. Then follow paragraphs about the Eucharist being a 'proper sacrifice,' and a 'continual sacrifice,' offered by our Saviour as the Priest after the order of Melchizedek. The reader will notice that he does not use the Tridentine expression 'propitiatory.' This part of the Charge contains passages of much feeling and beauty, which show the writer's soul soaring upward in a sort of mystical rapture, and thereby overcoming, or at least striving to overcome, the logical and practical difficulties which beset any attempt to describe the Eucharistic Sacrifice as truly identical with, or a continuance of, the Sacrifice of the Cross.

¹ For their opinions see my *Holy Communion*, ed. 2, p. 250 (1892). Mr. Humble seems to say that Bishop Andrewes decides in favour of the priest receiving standing. See his *Letter* (1859), p. 74, quoting *Elementa Liturgica*, by G. Walker, p. 112, ed. 2, and 'Bishop Cosin's Notes, 1st series,' v. p. 105. But whoever wrote these *Notes* is arguing *against* standing which was the puritan attitude (p. 112).

We rise (he says, p. 41) from the relative to the absolute. The nature of man is now introduced into the deepest recess of the heavenly choir, in the person of Jesus both God and Man, while on Earth every prayer is only accepted through Him; every thanksgiving only received in union with that thanksgiving which He is ever offering in His Humanity; and every praise, in conjunction with that high and eternal laud which is made by all the Saints and Angels on high, and by the Eternal High Priest after the order of Melchizedek.

Use is also made of the vision of the Lamb of God seen by St. John in the Apocalypse :—

The same Lamb of God, whom the rapt Apostle in Patmos saw in Heaven ‘as it had been slain,’ is now mystically offered in the Church below . . . and by virtue of the Holy Ghost our mystic sacrifice is now the Body and Blood of Him who offereth it. Yet this august solemnity, in which the Church of God glories, is purely spiritual, and in every way worthy of the Gospel covenant. In a Sacrament is the Lord’s death shown forth in representation. The *very image* has taken place of the *shadow*.

Section V. on *the Scottish Office* calls for no remark, except that he defends it largely as bringing us closer to antiquity and as thereby being a protection against new and false revelations

which exhibit themselves most offensively in Mormonism, less coarsely in Irvingism and in that school of the modern Roman Catholic Church which not only rests on the theory of development, but which lays so much store by that additional religion drawn from the visions and experiences of the Saints which began early in the history of the Church, and has continued through a long line, of which the most distinguished are St. Hildegard and St. Bridget, to this day (p. 44).

There was much in this Charge that was elevating and conducive to faith, to reverence, and even to awe. It must be read sympathetically to be fairly judged. There was

much evidence in it, too, of a desire to avoid offence, and to define the writer's position as a loyal Churchman, who understood the dangers of Roman teaching and wished to warn his hearers against them. But, nevertheless, it was not surprising that it created great excitement and alarm. It was not like the parallel treatises of Pusey and Keble, apologetic in character, justifying a position that was assailed, and in the main asking for toleration for unpopular or suspected opinions. It was a Bishop's teaching addressed *ex cathedra* to his flock. It seemed to drive its conclusions home with rigorous logic, and to force their acceptance on pain of incurring the suspicion of heterodoxy. Serious dilemmas are proposed to the reader, and the very moderation of the language, and the reverence and solemnity of its tone, make him feel uncomfortable if he demurs to teaching so evidently part of the life and faith of him who gave it. Occasionally, too, there is a sharp edge and a slighting treatment of opponents which could not but cause pain. On the whole, a plain man might well ask himself: 'Since the subject is confessedly so mysterious, and the conclusions are so much a matter of inference and not of direct revelation, has the Bishop any right to press me so hard?' I think this natural reluctance to be driven by so-called 'logic' had much to do with the temper in which the Charge was criticised, and especially considering how small the community was to which it was addressed; so that even an individual presbyter might feel he was called upon to accept its teaching; or, if he could not do so, obliged to clear himself from the imputation of accepting it. So, again, the fear of giving countenance to some insidious form of idolatry by adoring a Presence *in* the gifts—an expression much more restricted and local than those of Bishops Andrewes and William Forbes, which he quotes to justify it—a dislike to scholastic explanations such as that

of the 'supra-local presence'; a suspicion of distinctions like that between the active and the passive sacrifice, which was afterwards used to explain the alleged identity of the Eucharistic Sacrifice with the Sacrifice of the Cross; a fear above all of weakening faith in the one mediation of Christ and His one sacrifice for sin; all these not unworthy motives combined to make even careful men very anxious at this crisis, and inflamed the passions of many others who were easily roused by party cries.

The part taken by the Bishop of St. Andrews in the controversy was, as far as theological discussion went, a leading one. His nature and scholarly training prompted him to do eagerly and thoroughly whatever he undertook, and his power of stating his case, and his evident sincerity and desire to reach the bottom of his subject, made his authority great in the Councils of the Scottish Church at this juncture. His own experience no doubt made him specially anxious as to the result. He remarks in one of his notes on this case that, with the exception of Mr. Cheyne, all the 'esprits forts' of the Scottish Church were centred in the Diocese of St. Andrews, and all were men of the same party colour—any one of whom (he implies) would have been enough to throw a Diocese into a state of confusion. But while he was a leader in counsel on this great subject, and felt it necessary that both public and private remonstrances should be addressed to Bishop Forbes, he was anxious that action should be united, and not that of single Bishops engaging in controversy with their brethren. A great part of his activity was devoted to the end of securing joint action in anything that was done. As regards his own part in the conflict two things are abundantly manifest: first that he was very reserved in publishing his own opinions merely as his own; and secondly, that he studied very hard to form a right judg-

ment as one who must give account of his stewardship. He was perfectly justified in writing at a later date: 'If any man ever set himself honestly to endeavour to ascertain God's truth on the subject of the Holy Eucharist, I did so' ('MS. Note-book,' v. 19). Nor did he publish anything, through the booksellers, directly against Bishop Forbes. His 'Notes' and his 'Opinion' were printed only for private circulation. The 'Charge' of 1858 deals only with the fringe of the matter. The 'Charge' of 1859, published at the formal request of the Synod, did indeed necessarily contain some matter bearing on the Eucharistic controversy occasioned by the 'St. Ninian's Declaration'; and in an Appendix to it he reprinted his 'Pastoral Letter to the Laity of his Diocese,' dated 16 February, 1858, which dealt slightly with the controversy, but without mentioning the Bishop of Brechin by name. Besides this the only direct public and personal contribution he made to the controversy was an anonymous pamphlet entitled 'Proposals for Peace,' of which something will be said below.¹

Bishop Forbes naturally felt pained by the opposition of his brethren, especially, no doubt, that of his neighbour the Bishop of St. Andrews, but, as the latter says, 'the difference never led to personal estrangement or (I believe I may say) to cessation of esteem and regard on either side' ('MS. Note-book,' v. 19).

Without entering too much into detail I will mention the chief points in the progress of the controversy, which was not settled for two and a half years. The Charge was delivered 5 August, 1857, and judgment was given upon it 15 March, 1860. The first step was a discussion at a Synod of the Bishops held on 29 September, and again, more formally, at another on 11 December, 1857, both at Edinburgh. The Bishop of St. Andrews has preserved the

¹ See on this point Gordon's *Scotichronicon*, vi. 398 foll.

substance of what he said on the first of these two occasions. See his 'Charge' for 1858, p. 11 foll.

I said—I felt how very unworthy and how little qualified I was to pass a judgment upon what our right reverend brother had written upon such a subject—I had no doubt after much study and earnest prayer; taken in connection with other symptoms abroad the perusal of the Charge had made me, I confessed, not a little uneasy; that it seemed to me to go beyond the teaching to which we had been accustomed; more particularly that the tendency of its parts was to disturb, as I thought, the proportions of the faith; and I instanced the Articles of our Lord's Ascension and of the Descent of the Holy Ghost. I also remarked upon the disparaging manner in which our Bishops of the last century, whom we had hitherto regarded as among our first authorities on Eucharistic doctrine, are referred to in the Charge; and still more upon what appeared to me to be the unwarrantable assumption that the ancient Fathers of the Church would be found to teach what the Bishop ascribes to them as to the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

It is necessary just to mention this, as Bishop Forbes, through some confusion or inadvertence, forgot to notice this opinion, and represented the Bishop of Glasgow (Trower), who certainly showed the most active hostility, as alone having read and criticised the Charge at this Synod.¹ It was proposed to issue a declaration upon the subject of the Holy Eucharist in order to reassure the minds of those who might have been disturbed, but the proposal was lost or rather adjourned till next year.² The Bishop of St. Andrews, however, obtained from his brethren a declaration³ on a minor point on which he was now in controversy with Provost Fortescue, and which of course was closely connected in his mind with the sacrificial view of

¹ Forbes's *Charge*, ed. 2 (Lent 1858), Appendix, p. 66, repeated unaltered in ed. 3 (Easter 1858), p. 61. Cp. Bishop Trower's *Pastoral Letter*, p. 2.

² See on this some letters from Bishop Ewing, dated 13 December, 1857, in Ross's *Memoir*, p. 275.

³ See his *Charge* for 1858, p. 14.

the Eucharist, viz. the attendance of persons at Holy Communion without receiving. It was, as we have seen, the deliberate judgment of Bishop Torry that such persons should withdraw, and the Bishops, in agreement with the tradition on the subject, declared :

The custom of the Scottish Church does not authorise or sanction, but rather forbids, the practice of presence at Holy Communion of persons who are not to receive the Sacrament, and this Synod decidedly disapproves the practice. The Synod sees no sufficient reason for making an exception to the above declaration in the case of persons who have previously received the Holy Communion on the same day, or in the case of choirs.

This was a point on which many persons then felt strongly, and probably more strongly than at present, when the great frequency of Communion services makes it less natural for all communicants who are in the church to be prepared to communicate. But in Mr. Keble's judgment, as well as in that of the Bishop of St. Andrews, the practice, at least in its broader form, was open to serious criticism, and it must be carefully watched.¹

When the Synod was over those of the Bishops who felt themselves most concerned made use of the individual liberty reserved to them by the resolution finally adopted,² to issue a joint Pastoral—a proceeding which seems rather

¹ See Keble's *Letters of Spiritual Counsel*, L. cxvi. 207: 'I have a strong feeling against the foreign custom of encouraging *all sorts of persons* to "assist" at the Holy Eucharist without communicating. It seems to me open to two grave objections: it cannot be without danger of profaneness and irreverence to very many, and of consequent dishonour to the Holy Sacrament; and it has brought in or encouraged, or both (at least, so I greatly suspect), a notion of a quasi-sacramental virtue in such attendance, which I take to be great part of the error stigmatised in our xxxix Article. Even in such a good book as the *Imitatio Christi*, and still more in the *Paradisus Animæ*, one finds participating "in Missa vel Communione" spoken of as if one brought a spiritual benefit of the same order as the other. This I believe to be utterly unauthorised by Scripture and antiquity; and I can imagine it of very dangerous consequence.'

² See Bishops Eden and Wordsworth's *Statement* of 29 December 1857.

calculated to weaken the authority of the general body. The resolution clearly only contemplated single Bishops addressing their own Dioceses.

The agitation was chiefly in the Dioceses of Edinburgh and Glasgow, and Bishops Terrot (Primus) and Trower were joined by Bishop Ewing of Argyll—a warm-hearted, poetical, and impulsive man—in publishing a declaration of their own on the subject of the Eucharist, without, however, mentioning any names.¹ Almost at the same time Bishops Eden and Wordsworth put out a ‘Statement’ explaining why for the present they withheld any expression of their own opinion (29 December, 1857).² A copy of the ‘Three Bishops’ Declaration,’ as it may be called, was sent by someone to Mr. Keble. He mistakenly supposed that it was sent him by the Bishop of Edinburgh and that his teaching was specially censured in it. His reason for so doing was that he had sent his treatise on ‘Eucharistic

¹ There may be some doubt how far Bishop Terrot, who was a great mathematician but not much of a theologian, really wished this *Declaration* to be published. See Humble’s *Letter to the Bishop of St. Andrews* (1859), p. 18, note. There is very little on this controversy in Rev. Wm. Walker’s pleasant sketch of Bishop Terrot in his *Three Churchmen* (Edinb. 1893). Bishop Trower was certainly the leading spirit in the matter. The *Declaration* may be found in his *Pastoral Letter*, published in June 1858, p. 15 foll. Bishop Ewing was very half-hearted about it: see his *Memoir*, by Ross, p. 275. It may be found also in Rev. Donald J. Mackey’s *Bishop Forbes*, p. 98 foll. (1888), but in neither copy is it dated. It must, however, have been between 14 and 24 December, 1857, since it is mentioned as in hand in Bishop Ewing’s letter of the 13th, and occasioned the Clerical declaration to which Bishop Terrot replied on the 26th. Bishop Trower’s action at this time led also to the loss of [Dr.] Wm. Bright’s services to the Church in Scotland. He was then Bell Lecturer and Tutor at Glenalmond, and is now the honoured Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford: see his *Statement of Facts* (London, Masters, 1858).

² The *Statement*, by Bishops Eden and Wordsworth, may be found printed in a disagreeable pamphlet, entitled *Romanism and Scottish Episcopacy, a word with the Scottish Bishops on their declaration and statement*, &c. by Veritas. Edinb. T. Constable & Co. &c. (1858), pp. 31 foll. The Clerical address to Bishop Trower, and his reply on 26 December, are also printed, p. 34.

Adoration' to the Scottish Bishops, and supposed that this was an answer to it; though he certainly should have been undeceived when he observed that particular expressions were censured, which he had not used, and which had been used by Bishop Forbes. Mr. Keble probably considered (as on a later occasion) that as a Canon of Cumbrae he had also a sort of *locus standi* in the matter. His letter is in the rather provocative form of a series of interrogatives. It seems to me chiefly important from the suggestion that the 'substantial identity of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist with the Sacrifice of the Cross' might be explained by the supposition that the former was a repetition of our Lord's sacrifice before His Passion in the Upper Room. If the disputants had meant this generally no doubt the controversy could have been settled more readily. This letter was published by Mr. Keble himself in the 'Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal,' a proceeding, like many others at this time, which was hardly considerate or conciliatory.

In Scotland itself the Declaration of the Three Bishops was met by an address from the Dean and nineteen clergy of the Diocese of Edinburgh, expressing their full concurrence, but still making no reference to Bishop Forbes. A similar address was adopted by the clergy in the Diocese of Glasgow. Early, however, in February 1858 a memorial, signed eventually by nearly six hundred laymen, was presented to the Bishops in which he was named, and this of course made a peaceful solution less easy, and, indeed, may be said to have forced the Bishops into action.

On the 16th of the same month the Bishop of St. Andrews addressed a short 'Pastoral Letter to the Laity of his Diocese,'¹ in which he states that he departed from

¹ This letter was printed by him as an appendix to his *Charge* of 1859, pp. 31-33. He did not reprint it with his *Charge* of 1858, in accordance with his desire to act with reserve as far as he was an individual.

his resolution not to take any part in the controversy that had arisen, except as a member of the Episcopal Synod, in deference to the urgent representation of several of his clergy. Bishop Forbes is not mentioned, and the letter is directed generally to discourage excitement and too confident definition of mysterious truths. In it the question of Adoration is hardly touched; but, as regards the Sacrifice, the Bishop commits himself to the use of the terms 'virtue and effect,' of which Bishop Forbes had spoken so slightly.

On the other hand the Bishops received another address, signed eventually by about sixty¹ of the clergy—a large number for Scotland—pointing out the inconvenience of the issue by the Bishops of declarations on points of doctrine which wore the aspect of definitions, and deprecating quasi-definitions of faith by individual prelates.²

Nevertheless, very possibly the storm might have passed over without an open rupture between Bishop Forbes and his brethren, had it not been for the inopportune appearance of Mr. Patrick Cheyne's 'Six Sermons on the Doctrine of the most Holy Eucharist,' with a preface, dated Septuagesima [31 January], 1858. These sermons, with one exception, that on 'Adoration'—which shows evident traces of the influence of Keble and Forbes—had been preached in Lent 1857. Their publication now was distinctly a stirring up of strife. It was also one of the unfortunate features of Scottish Church History at this time that the antagonisms incident to contested elections to Bishoprics were prolonged afterwards, and sometimes

¹ This is the number of signatures given by Mr. Humble, *Letter, &c.*, 1859, p. 19. He gives the *Clerical Address* as Appendix H.

² See also Mackey's *Forbes*, p. 106. This and the *Lay Memorial*, and other papers, may be found in *Documents &c. circulated to the Lay Memorialists by their Committee*. Edinb. R. Grant & Son, 1858.

became very like personal conflicts. This was not only the case in the Diocese of St. Andrews, but also in those of Aberdeen and Brechin.

Mr. Cheyne, who had been Incumbent of St. John's, Aberdeen, for nearly forty years, and was much respected in that city, was a candidate for the office of Bishop after the death (15 April, 1857) of the then Primus, the third Bishop Skinner, when Bishop Suther was elected.¹ Mr. Henderson, who afterwards promoted the case against Bishop Forbes, was in a similar position in the Diocese of Brechin. Mr. Cheyne's sermons were, as he himself calls them, 'mere sketches,' with almost no justificatory notes, but they were sufficiently aggressive to call forth immediate criticism. They were published evidently in consequence of the three Bishops' Pastoral, and were a sort of challenge to the Bishop of Aberdeen, who had so far remained neutral.²

Mr. Cheyne's teaching was indeed, in its general result, much the same as that of the Bishop of Brechin, but it was expressed in a hard and irritating manner, and without the balancing considerations and explanations and respect for the feelings of opponents often, though not always, manifest in the Charge.

Bishop Forbes himself says of the sermons, at the commencement of his 'Opinion' on Cheyne's appeal, 'Under the circumstances I have regretted very much the publication of these sermons.' 'There is a baldness of statement in

¹ Bishop Suther was consecrated at Edinburgh 24 June, 1857.

² On Quinquagesima Sunday [14 February] 1858 Keble wrote to Pusey: 'I am so sorry this storm has reached your ears. But if Bishop Forbes will be quite patient, as I trust he will, there seems hope of its turning to good. I believe the Bishops of St. Andrews and Moray [Eden] and Aberdeen are all peaceably inclined. But the pressure from the Edinburgh and other laity is excessive.' Liddon's *Pusey*, iii. 450. Cp. his reference to Cheyne's sermons on the next page.

some parts of the sermons more apt to startle than convince.' 'It is barely charity to men's souls to state doctrines in a provocative form;' ¹ and other things to the same effect. What others thought of them may therefore easily be imagined. The following notes will give a fair notion, I trust, of their contents.

In Sermon I., 'The Great Act of Christian Worship,' the Eucharist is treated as 'the daily sacrifice of the new law' (p. 15).

In II. 'The Real Presence' is thus defined, 'I mean as the Church means, that, after Consecration, whole Christ, God and Man, is really, truly and substantially present in the Eucharist under the form of bread and wine' (p. 22).

In III. 'The Sacrifice . . . in the Eucharist is substantially the same as the Sacrifice of the Cross, because the Priest is the same in both, and the Victim the same in both,' but there is an obvious difference in the manner of offering. 'Yet our offering is not bread and wine, which would be inconsistent with the unity of Christ's Sacrifice, and something more worthless than the sacrifices under the law. What we offer is the Body and Blood of Christ under the form of Bread and Wine. That is the substance of our sacrifice.'

This was not unnaturally interpreted as a teaching of Transubstantiation.²

It is then explained that the only thing necessary to the completion of the Sacrifice is the Communion of the Priest,

¹ *Opinion of the Bishop of Brechin in the Appeal of the Rev. P. Cheyne.* Edinb. R. Lendrum & Co.; London, J. Masters and Co. 1858. Mr. Malcolm MacColl, in 1860, in his letter to Mr. Gladstone, *Mr. Cheyne and the Bishop of Brechin*, argues that their opinions were practically the same, and that the gentle treatment given to Bishop Forbes should be extended to Mr. Cheyne.

² Mr. Cheyne says in his *Reasons of Appeal*, p. 17, that he asserted that 'the substance of Bread and Wine remains together with the Body and Blood.' I cannot find the words in any of the *Six Sermons* in Mr. Hunter's copy. This would be Lutheran consubstantiation. Cp. Forbes's *Opinion*, p. 25.

and it is not necessary that all who join in offering it should at the same time receive the Communion; though 'it is desirable, and to their great benefit, if they could (p. 34); but they may plead the merits of the one Sacrifice, and in a degree share them, when circumstances prevent them from communicating; and the Church has always allowed it.' This reservation 'in a degree' is emphasised by Bishop Forbes in his 'Opinion' defending, or rather acquitting, the Defendant (p. 20).

Lastly, 'the Eucharist is called a Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead.'

IV., 'The Adoration,' is, as I have hinted, based on Keble and Forbes. We do not kneel to the outward visible signs in the Sacrament; we kneel to the Lord Himself invisibly present 'under the form of bread and wine; though even to these outward things, after consecration, we give religious honour' (p. 46).

V., 'The Communion,' contains an exaggerated statement: 'To us men there is no other way of partaking of Christ's Flesh and Blood but receiving them sacramentally in the Eucharist, because there alone has He vouchsafed them to be really and substantially present.' This is practically to assert that our Lord's language in St. John vi. relates *only* to the Eucharist; whereas some orthodox commentators have doubted whether there is *any*, or at least *any principal, reference* to the Eucharist in that chapter,¹ and many of the Fathers certainly include other ways of feeding upon Christ besides the one.² Our own Church in the 'Prayer of humble access' no doubt inter-

¹ On a later page, however, Cheyne makes an exception in regard to Spiritual Communion when the Eucharist cannot be obtained (p. 57).

² See the evidence collected by Dr. John Harrison in his *Dr. Pusey's Challenge Answered*, 2 vols. (1871), and summarised in his *Letter to Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on his unfair treatment of the testimony of the Fathers* § 36 onwards.

prets this language of the Eucharistic feeding, but not necessarily in any exclusive way. For my own part I do not doubt that our Lord's language is largely Eucharistic here, and occupies a place in the Gospel parallel to His teaching as to Baptism in dealing with Nicodemus, but I could not restrict its application to the Sacrament. Further, the receivers, whether they be good or bad, 'Whatever they are, all receive the same thing sacramentally—all receive the sign and the thing signified. The Body and Blood of Christ are received both by good and bad' &c. (p. 56).

In VI. 'The Intention' is not worked out as clearly and fully as the rest. It seems desired to make more frequent celebrations useful to those who attend them, by fixing the minds of the worshippers either on some special object of their own or on that chosen by the priest. Probably the mention of intercession for the faithful departed in a note to p. 69 reveals the chief thought in the preacher's mind.

Such teaching, in the temper of those times, could not pass without an attempt at least to secure its condemnation. Pressure was put upon the Bishop from Edinburgh through a lay friend, who represented that a serious schism, far surpassing the Drummond Schism, would ensue if Mr. Cheyne's sermons were allowed to pass unchallenged, and certain passages, which the reader will easily gather from the foregoing summary, were 'presented' to Bishop Suther by the Rev. Gilbert Rorison (an able man, then influential in the Diocese), Incumbent of St. Peter's, Peterhead, and two others on 23 April, 1858.¹ On the 26th of the same month Bishop Suther found that there were *primâ facie* grounds for the accusation and present-

¹ Most of the documents in this case are collected in a convenient form in *Reasons of Appeal, by the Rev. Patrick Cheyne, &c.*, Aberdeen, A. Brown & Co.; Edinb. Lendrum; London, J. Masters & Co. (1858)—one of Mr. Hunter's pamphlets.

ment, and summoned the Prosecutors and Defendant to appear at a Special Diocesan Synod to be held on Tuesday, 15 June, advising the parties to restrict their arguments to the formularies of the Scottish and English Reformed Churches, and to the authority of theological writers of those Churches—a restriction which produced much excited and adverse comment.¹

In the meantime Bishop Forbes had given further circulation to his Charge, which was issued in a second edition, the preface of which bears date 'Lent 1858,' and in a third and cheaper form dated 'Eastertide.' The second edition is very much larger than the first, and contains not only new passages in square brackets, but a Preface,² authorities, notes, and appendix covering many pages. It contains certain explanations or modifications tending to make his language slightly more acceptable, and notably two: on p. 36 'the external *προσκύνησις* that is due to it' (i.e. the Sacrament) is changed to 'due to CHRIST therein given to be verily and indeed taken and received;' and on p. 41 foll. the distinction between the active and the passive Sacrifice is introduced: 'actively it is the rite, passively it is the victim.' Strangely enough, he makes the same tacit transition as Keble does to the Sacrifice of the Upper Room, first identifying the Sacrifice (i.e. the Victim) of the Eucharist with the Sacrifice of the Cross, and then quoting St. Chrysostom on 1 Tim. i. 8–12, who says, 'It is

¹ See, for some remarks on this point, an anonymous *Letter to the Dean of Moray*, dated Edinb. 17 January, 1859, in reply to an invitation to attend a conference at Laureneekirk (held Thursday, 20 January) to protest against the treatment of Mr. Cheyne, pp. 2 foll.

² The Bishop of St. Andrews, in a MS. note, criticises the tone of this Preface rather severely, and speaks of it as determining him in the opinion that some answer was necessary. It describes his cause as 'the cause of truth,' and states his confidence in the 'eventual triumph' of his teaching, as in accordance with all authority. If Forbes had said that the teaching was worthy of toleration as a contribution to theology on a mysterious subject, it would have been more to the purpose.

the same (Oblation) which Christ gave to His disciples and which is now made by His priests' (p. 42).¹ The third edition contains additional matter on 'the power and efficacy theory of the Real Presence,' see pp. 19 foll.

Here again we may regret that the Bishop thought it necessary to push his Charge so prominently into notice. Keble, in writing to Pusey in February, had expressed a hope that Bishop Forbes might be 'quite patient,' and perhaps had desired to draw on himself, by his letter to Bishop Terrot, the electric fire which would otherwise discharge upon his friend. But Keble was not very prudent in his manner of entrance into the contest, and Forbes was not naturally 'quite patient'; and so it came to pass, by a concurrence of all these circumstances, and by a wish to relieve and quiet the growing agitation, especially among the laity, that at the Special Synod held at Edinburgh on 27 May, Bishop Forbes's teaching was openly but affectionately censured, and the Bishop himself admonished by all his six brethren in a Synodal or Pastoral Letter.² This letter, addressed 'to all faithful members of the Church in Scotland,' was drafted by the Bishop of St. Andrews and accepted by the other Bishops, after a few verbal alterations.³ It was no slight achievement to unite such different men in a document of some length on such a difficult subject. It

¹ On this see below, p. 146, and my uncle's *Notes*, Chap. I. p. 7.

² It was hence called, especially by its opponents, the *Six Bishops' Pastoral*. It might, perhaps, have been more Synodal in character if the signatures had been differently arranged, the Primus signing it 'in the name of the Synod,' and the others 'subscribing' as giving their assent to it. But the Scottish system has been jealous of Primacy.

³ See the *Scotichronicon*, vi. 398, ed. by Rev. J. F. S. Gordon, D.D. My uncle had an interleaved copy of the section relating to his own life (up to 1868), in which he inserted a few corrections. What he did not correct may, therefore, probably be accepted as accurate. I find from a note in the Bishop's handwriting that this memoir was mainly drawn up under his directions by his sister-in-law, Miss Mary Barter, and his former pupil and friend, Rev. W. Shaw, Incumbent of Forfar.

became, of course, the subject of much controversy, not only as to its matter, but as to the right which the Synod exercised on censuring the writings of a brother Bishop, and as to the opportuneness of its act. As regards the Synodal Letter itself, the matter of which was roughly handled in some quarters, it appears to me to be dignified, reasonable, and moderate, and on that account it was not pleasing to the agitators who clamoured for an unequivocal condemnation.¹ In some points, indeed, the Synodal Letter would, a few years earlier, have been considered rather a High Church document. It touched naturally for censure on two salient points: the enforcement of supreme adoration as due to Christ, mysteriously present in the gifts, and the assertion of the substantial unity or identity of the Sacrifice of the Altar and the Sacrifice of the Cross.² The rejection of this teaching as unscriptural and having led to corruptions and superstitions, and the exhortation to the faithful members of the Church, especially to the clergy, not to exceed or fall short in their teaching of the Truth in regard to the Blessed Sacrament, is justified as a right essentially inherent in a Provincial Episcopate.³ This last was a point

¹ See for the opinions of such critics the pamphlet *Romanism and Scottish Episcopacy*, by Veritas, published early in 1858, and before the Synodal Letter was issued.

² Dr. Pusey, in Keble's *Considerations*, p. 48 foll., complains that it is a hardship that the *Pastoral* attributes to Bishop Forbes language which is not his, and is 'itself in part not carefully worded;' and compares it to the procedure in the case of 'the members of the Porte Royale,' who were called upon to condemn propositions which they declared were not in the works of Jansenius as being there. I cannot see that any real injustice is done, though it might have been better to have drawn attention to Forbes' lately introduced distinction between the active and the passive sacrifice. The 'Sacrifice of the Altar,' as used by the Bishops in a later paragraph, means the ritual of the altar; as explained by Forbes, in his second edition, it means 'the Victim of the Altar Sacrifice.'

³ See Appendix II. The Synodal Letter may be also found in Bishop Trower's *Pastoral*, in Keble's *Considerations*, in the Bishop of St. Andrews' *Notes on the Eucharist* and in his *Charges* for 1858 and 1859 &c.

on which Bishop Forbes vehemently protested, and chiefly on the grounds that the duties of the Episcopal Synod were defined by the canons, and that to assume other powers was *ultra vires*.

His protest was, however, disregarded, and the letter, after being read by the Primus, was adopted as a Synodal act on the motion of Bishop Eden of Moray, whose adhesion to the policy embodied in it had been previously doubted in some quarters, and was important on account of the weight and influence of his character. It was then resolved, on the motion of the Bishop of St. Andrews, that it should be formally communicated to the Diocesan Synods, so that the clergy might, if they chose, take it into consideration.

The two following letters from the Bishop's father-in-law—Rev. William Brudenell Barter, and his brother Christopher—show how the Pastoral was received by strong and critically minded men in his own circle. That from Mr. Barter is remarkable, as he had not long before written a pamphlet in defence of Archdeacon Denison.¹

The first is dated 'Burghclere, 31 May, 1858':

As you are kind enough to ask my opinion, I think that, if you were obliged to do anything of the kind, you could not have done better than you have done, but I would not go one hair's breadth further. My view of the subject, which I have often printed, is this: That the consecrated Elements are verily and indeed the Body and Blood of Christ to the Communicants—and to the Communicants only—not the Body and Blood of Christ to be held up for adoration. I think St. Paul's words plainly imply this when he says the Bread and Wine are 'the Communion' &c. May God prosper your single-hearted labor in His service. . . . I am most happy to see that all the Bishops are unanimous; this is indeed a good sign. I trust none will be

¹ *Remarks on the Proceedings in the Case of Archdeacon Denison.* As there is no date or publisher's name I presume this was not published. The point specially touched is that of reception by the wicked.

tempted by popular favor to go further. The 'few words'¹ in which your decrees have gone forth will give them real weight.

The second letter is as follows :

Stanford-in-the-Vale, Faringdon : 31 May, 1858.

Thank God for the Pastoral. It is indeed a blessed manifestation of His Love in overruling evil for good ; and the happy unanimity of the Six Bishops of the Church of Christ in Scotland will do more good than the unhappy declension of the one. Your packet arrived yesterday, on a blessed day, Trinity Sunday, and was in happy harmony with its holy services. I am going to stay with the Bishop of Oxford this evening and to-morrow, and am sure that he will rejoice with you and your brethren.

The following letter of the Bishop to Sir Archibald Edmonstone,² a religious layman, who wrote to him in some anxiety as to the claim disputed by the Bishop of Brechin, and as to the position of the letter as an authoritative judgment, throws considerable light on the attitude of the Synod. It is dated Perth, 7 June, 1858.

MY DEAR SIR ARCHIBALD,—The case of our late Pastoral letter appears to me to be simply this : We have undertaken in Synod to censure a book—and that Book a Brother-Bishop's Charge.

Is such censorship allowable in the Church ? and if so, who are to exercise it ? In England it has been exercised by both Houses of Convocation, and even by the lower House alone—in the case of a publication by a Bishop, e.g. Bishop Burnet's book on the 'Thirty-nine Articles,' and Bishop Hoadly's notorious sermon on 'Christ's Kingdom.' No one questioned the right of the Church, *quâ* Church, to exercise the power by the Representative Synod ; the only question raised was whether it would be an interference with the Queen's supremacy ; and this was decided in the Church's favour by the Privy Council, upon an opinion given by the Judges, who were 8 to 4 on that side

¹ This is an allusion to the Bishop's habit of bantering him on the titles of his pamphlets, 'a few words on'—so and so.

² Lady Edmonstone was a Miss Wilbraham.

(see Lathbury's 'History of Convocation,' chap. xii., where eight distinct cases are mentioned). In this country, where the principles of Bishop Sage have been adopted¹ (whether rightly or wrongly), the Episcopal Synod is the Church's ordinary Representative Council—to the exclusion of the Presbytery. And I suppose no one will doubt that if the *Lower House* of Convocation could properly censure a Bishop's book (which certainly does seem a questionable proceeding), much more may our Episcopal Synod do the same. In short, we have claimed a power of censorship, as a right of the Church, and a right belonging, by the constitution of our own Church, to the Episcopal Synod. And now, what is this power worth? I imagine it is worth very little—except to *reassure* the minds of our people when they *have been disturbed*. As against the Bishop of Brechin, and those who think with him, the only measure of their authority is their disposition to be guided by it. They *can* still, if they *will*, not only hold, but teach and preach as before. And for my own part, if any of them were to be brought to a formal trial, I should not allow the Pastoral letter to have any weight—otherwise than as a ground for repeating the same censure, in a case of preaching and publishing. Of course in this way a charge might arise on the plea of insubordination, but every such charge rests obviously upon a very precarious foundation, where the authority pleaded on our side would have nothing in it of a strictly legal force.

Perhaps I need not say more than this: however, to show how cheerfully I accept your kind overture for correspondence on the subject—painful as it is—I will add:

1. Where we speak of the Bishop's teaching we merely make known what we *think*; and, of course, we are liable to *think* wrong as well as he.

2. When we *exhort* the clergy we refer simply to Scripture and the Formularies of the Church, which the Bishop's Charge appears to us to *narrow* in a very exclusive and intolerant way.

3. We notice the terms 'Real objective presence,' not as objecting to the truth which they are intended to convey (I, for

¹ Reference is made, I presume, to Sage's *Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, and to his *Vindication* of the same treatise, esp. chap. vii. §§ 69, 70 of the latter, p. 447 foll., in vol. ii. of Sage's Works, ed. Spottiswoode Soc. 1846. Bishop Sage died in 1711.

one, could not join in any such objection—and in all that you have written on this subject I quite concur), but simply to draw attention to the fact (not an unimportant one) that they are novel; and as wishing to guard against any attempt to *fix* the *mind* of the Church within narrower limits than she herself has prescribed, by the intervention of new Phrases. . . .

As to the powers of the Episcopal Synod, the Bishop of St. Andrews obtained an important opinion from his friend, Roundell Palmer, afterwards Lord Selborne. He held that it had no coercive or disciplinary powers, and could do no disciplinary act, having a binding or efficacious force, in excess of those expressly or implicitly conferred by the Canons of the Church. But he also held that it was clearly capable of exercising large powers of pastoral instruction and of the utterance of counsels on matters of doctrine, and that such proceedings were manifestly appropriate to the position and functions of its members as Bishops.¹

The real question was probably not so much whether the Bishops had the right, but whether it was wise to exercise it at the moment. On this it is not very easy to form an opinion. In December 1857 the Bishops of Moray and St. Andrews² had declined, as we have seen, to join their three colleagues, on the ground that the subject would probably be discussed again at the next annual Synod, and because they had been informed that the charges against Bishop Forbes were likely to lead to judicial proceedings against him, which would, of course, come before the Synod in another capacity. Now, the meeting in May was not the annual Synod, but a special one; and judicial proceedings, though then dormant, did actually take place later. It is impossible not to wish that their attitude of reserve could

¹ See the quotations from this *Opinion* in the Bishop's *Charge* for 1859, p. 27. .

² See their *Statement*, dated 29 December, 1857, referred to above, p. 100.

have been maintained longer, as extra-judicial proceedings by a body which may be called to act judicially are always liable to be misunderstood. The Bishop's letter to Sir A. Edmonstone shows that he felt this to be a difficulty. We can only suppose that the outside pressure of unsettlement, especially among laymen, was felt to be extreme; and that it was hoped by the Bishops that the issue of the Letter would discharge them from the necessity of entering further into the matter. The defenders, too, of the Charge were, it seems, triumphantly proclaiming that its doctrine was that of the Church—and this, of course, was a serious difficulty, due in a great degree to the way in which Bishop Forbes expressed himself, as if his teaching on this difficult subject was not only to be tolerated, but to be accepted as authoritative and as the mind of the Church at large.

The Synodal Letter, so issued, was followed very shortly by a separate and lengthy *Pastoral* by Bishop Trower, reviewing the proceedings that had followed the Brechin Charge. It had been written, and mainly printed, in February, but was held back until after the Synod. Some time later in the year—in June or July—Mr. Keble again came forward with his 'Considerations Suggested by a Late Pastoral Letter on the Doctrine of the most Holy Eucharist,' a pamphlet of fifty-four pages of small print, in which Pusey took a considerable share¹ in revising the proofs and writing an appendix. But he was then in bad health, and consequently the greater share of the work fell upon Keble.² He writes as a Presbyter to his brother Presbyters, urging that the Pastoral Letter was not a Synodical Act, 'because Presbyters have a right to be present in Synods, and because the discussion was carried on with closed doors,

¹ See Liddon's *Pusey*, iii. 452 foll.

² In the following sentences I am much indebted to my friend Prof. Walter Lock's *John Keble*, pp. 166 foll., 7th ed. 1895.

and the judgment given without any statement of the reasons; hence the Presbyters are not bound to accept it as authoritative.' He acknowledges what he considered the good points of the Pastoral, especially its reserve and its positive statements, but criticises its negative statements as tending to Nestorianism—the separation of Christ into two persons. He holds, however, himself (and in this he seems to vary from the view of Bishop Forbes), that the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is not so much identical with the Sacrifice of the Cross as with that which Christ offered in the Upper Room and is now offering in Heaven. He pleads further for toleration and for not being afraid of the mere word 'Roman,' since we ought to be glad to agree with any branch of the Church in a matter of truth. We must not shrink from any fulness of devotion, but 'put forth all our strength' (Ecclus. xliii. 30), since our temptation to undervalue the atmosphere of mysteries and miracles in which we live is so great.

It may surely be questioned how far it was fit and proper that Mr. Keble should thus intervene to suggest opposition on the part of one order of the ministry in Scotland against the other, and I imagine that this was a point on which his own conscience touched him afterwards. But the matter of the tract is full of interest, though it had, perhaps, little immediate result. Then followed, on 5 August, the condemnation and suspension of Mr. Cheyne by the Bishop of Aberdeen, in a very short and technically assailable judgment, in which, however, he acquitted him formally of the charge of teaching Transubstantiation.

In September 1858 the Bishop of St. Andrews for the first time gave any full expression to his own personal views on the subject. He circulated amongst the clergy of his Diocese and the Scottish Presbyters generally—but not to the general public—a large quarto pamphlet of sixty-six

ages—now very scarce—entitled, ‘Notes to Assist towards a Right Judgment on the Eucharistic Controversy,’ at the end of which the Pastoral is printed with the title ‘Copy of the Synodal Letter.’ The Bishop explains that his ‘Notes’ were written some months before for his own use, and now circulated in consequence, as is clearly implied, of Mr. Keble’s ‘Considerations.’ These ‘Notes’ are, in my opinion, of great value as really adding to the information possessed by the parties in regard to the documents quoted and the authorities referred to. They were never published; but the Bishop at one time revised them and prepared them for publication. The reader will profit by the following summary, short as it is.

In Chapter I.—*On the testimony of the Fathers, and especially on the statement that ‘the ancient doctors teach that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is the same substantially with that of the Cross’*—the author goes through the testimonies alleged by Bishop Forbes, and certainly, it seems to me, makes good his objections to almost all the passages quoted. The passages from St. Chrysostom on Heb. x. 1–9 and 1 Tim. i. 8–12 are treated with great justice. As to the first he shows that Chrysostom three times corrects himself, and so guards himself against being supposed to extend the identity of Sacrifice, which he recognises, to a substantial sameness. Under the second his note is exactly just: ‘Here is a testimony to prove—what we all believe—that our Eucharistic Sacrifice is the same in substance as that which our Lord Himself first administered, but *nothing whatever* to show that St. Chrysostom regarded the Sacrifice of the Eucharist as substantially the same with *the Sacrifice of the Cross*. There is a passage precisely similar in Homily i. § 3 on St. Matthew, viii. 581’ (p. 7). The observations on St. Augustine and Theodoret are also forcible. St. Augustine is not a very consistent writer, but the balance

of his teaching on the whole is in favour of the doctrine of a *commemorative* sacrifice, both in the active and the passive sense—‘*peracti iam sacrificii memoria.*’ The teaching of Theodoret on Heb. viii. 4 is distinctly of a cold and low type, and as a whole it could not be cited in favour of the Charge.

Chapter II., *on the use of the words ‘substantial’ and ‘objective’ in this controversy*, is full of interesting matter. While criticising Forbes and his supporters, he says, ‘I would no less maintain, with all the great Anglican divines, that the elements through consecration undergo a *change*,’ and he guards himself and the other signatories of the Synodal Letter from being supposed ‘to confine the Presence simply to the Recipient’ (p. 19).

Chapter III. is *on Eucharistic Adoration and the English Canons of 1640.*

Chapter IV., *on the alleged testimony of Bishop Andrewes* (pp. 34–36), and other *great English Divines*, seems to me very judicious and fair. The Bishop goes so far as to say, ‘I am persuaded that Anglican theology must be re-written before it can be fairly brought to support either of the conclusions which the Synod has disapproved’ (p. 41).

Chapter V., *on the fallacious reasoning attributed to the censured Charge*, is also full of point.

Chapter VI., *on the tendency of the same Charge to undermine the great foundations on which our formularies rest &c.*, is shorter and less effective; but the Bishop makes a fair point of the slighting treatment of the Scottish divines of the last century by Bishop Forbes (p. 51).

Chapter VII., *on the imputation of narrowing the terms of Communion and on the authority of the Synodal Letter*, takes up the precedent of the declaration on Baptism in 1850, when the Scottish Church so cleared itself from complicity with the Gorham Judgment, and describes the Synodal Letter as an ‘act of censorship’ not having any force of

law, but 'a godly admonition having more than ordinary weight, because collective and Synodical.'

The following passage on the Sacrifice may suffice as a specimen of what the Scottish Bishops intended positively to teach. It is taken from a sort of catena of Anglican divines.

They have followed Archbishop Bramhall, who acknowledges 'an Eucharistical Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving: a commemorative Sacrifice, or memorial of the Sacrifice of the Cross; a representative Sacrifice, or a representation of the Passion of Christ before the Eyes of His Heavenly Father; an impetrative Sacrifice, or an impetration of the Fruit and benefits of His Passion, by way of real prayer; and lastly an applicative Sacrifice, or an application of His merits to our souls:' all which is expressed in the Synodal Letter; and he adds, '*Let him that dare, go one step further than we do.*'—ii. 276 (p. 59).

On Tuesday, the 14th of the same month of September 1858, at St. Ninian's, Perth, the Bishop of St. Andrews delivered his Charge at the Synod, at which Canon Humble preached. It was, as usual, followed next day by the Visitation. Among the subjects of the Charge were naturally 'the Pastoral Letter,' explaining his reasons for moving that it should be communicated to the Diocesan Synod; the *declaration on non-recipient attendance*, on which he did not ask for Synodal action on the part of the Diocese, but rather trusted to the influence of forbearance, quoting St. Augustine, 'Aliud est quod docemus, aliud quod sustinemus'¹; and the 'Clerical Address to the College of Bishops,' whom he defends with some warmth. The treatment of these points is on the whole in a reserved, conciliatory, and rather apologetic tone. The author shows, however, a certain natural resentment at the suppression

¹ Printed 'sustenemus,' but corrected tacitly to 'sustinemus' (Charge of 1859, 26 note).

by Bishop Forbes of any reference to his own action at the Episcopal Synod in September 1857 (p. 11), and at the use of his name, in some quarters not specified, 'as of one who generally concurred in the teaching of the Charge' (p. 12). The issue of the Pastoral or Synodal Letter is defended as a practical step required by the pressure of those who desired to have guidance—both those clergy and laity who signed memorials, and by those multitudes who did not do so, but waited patiently trusting that the Bishops would do their duty.

The strained condition of affairs at the Cathedral is not referred to with any detail, but mention is made of the 'Resignation of Five Prebendaries' (p. 19), 'in consequence of differences between them and the resident clergy, solely upon public grounds,' and the closing of the Grammar School 'which has been so ably conducted by Mr. Sellar in this place during the last four years, and maintained chiefly through the liberality of Mr. G. Boyle and his friends; the premises not being sufficient to receive such a number of pupils as would be required to make the institution remunerative and self-supporting' (p. 20).

At the end of the month (30 September), Mr. Cheyne made his first appeal to the College of Bishops, in the technical part of which he had the assistance of an able Aberdeen advocate Mr. Grub.¹ The latter part of his 'Reasons of Appeal' (dated 2 October, pp. 15-69) is remarkable for its frequent references to the teaching of the Scottish divines of the previous century.

A meeting of the Bishops took place on 2 November, and a Synod, to hear this case, on the 4th. The Primus

¹ This was no doubt the eminent historian of the Church of Scotland, Dr. George Grub, who did not, however, agree with the advanced views of his friends: see Rev. Wm. Walker (of Monymusk), *Three Churchmen*, p. 206, Edinb. 1893. He did not sign the address to Mr. Cheyne from the congregation of St. John's.

(Bishop Terrot) was prevented from attending by a stroke of paralysis, and Bishop Ewing, of Argyll, as senior Bishop, took the chair. But as he disliked definitions on such mysterious subjects and religious prosecutions in general, though he was much opposed to what he called 'materialistic' teaching on the Eucharist, he took no active part in the proceedings, and did not vote or give an opinion.¹ We have upon this case the printed 'Opinions' of the Bishop of Brechin and the Bishop of St. Andrews. I have already quoted some of the opening sentences of the former showing how dissatisfied Bishop Forbes was with the form and expression of the sermons. In the body of the 'Opinion' the arguments in favour of Mr. Cheyne are ably stated, and the sermons explained in the best sense they are capable of. The Bishop of St. Andrews' 'Opinion' is, as might be expected, severe, and is directed to show, what certainly was a natural inference from the sermons, that they contained a general scheme of doctrine tending in a Roman direction. But his actual judgment is not severe, and suggests that the Appellant should be invited to make satisfaction to the Church by recalling certain passages. The three statements² censured were: (1) 'The Sacrifice of the Eucharist is substantially the same as the Sacrifice of the Cross, differing only in the manner of offering.' (2) 'In the Lord's Supper we kneel to the Lord Himself invisibly present under the form, or under the veils, of Bread and Wine.' (3) 'The only thing necessary to the completion of the Sacrifice is the Communion of the Priest.' In regard to these the Court adopted the Bishop of St. Andrews' opinion, finding 'that the teaching of the Appellant complained of in the Presentment is erroneous and more or less subversive of the doctrines of the Church, as

¹ See A. J. Ross, *Memoir of Alex. Ewing* (1877), p. 284 foll.

² See [Bishop of St. Andrews'] *Proposals for Peace*, pp. 31, 32.

explained in the opinions of the majority of the Court now delivered.'¹ The Court was adjourned to 2 December to give Mr. Cheyne an opportunity of retracting.

On 16 November, 1858, Mr. W. B. Barter, father of Mrs. Wordsworth, died at his Rectory of Burghelere in his 71st year.² He was a High Churchman, and had been long intimate with Newman, as he continued to be with Pusey and Keble, having been in 1811 elected Fellow of Oriel College, at the same time as Whately and Keble. As a man of strong and active intelligence, always disposed to think for himself, but in entire submission to Church principles, he had taken an independent part in most of the controversies of the period, and might almost be said to be the leader of a school.³ He was a determined English Churchman, especially keen in his denunciation of the Calvinist doctrine of 'unconditional salvation,' which he thought might easily be allied with Antinomianism, socialism, and infidelity. He was, like his younger brother, the Warden of Winchester, a man not only of robust physique and manly character, but also very warm-hearted, and attractive in his personality and devoted to duty. He

¹ The Bishops of Glasgow, Moray and Ross, and St. Andrews formed the majority, the Bishop of Brechin dissenting, and the Bishop of Argyll abstaining from voting.

² Mr. Barter was second son of the Rev. Charles Barter, who was Vicar of Cornworthy, on the banks of the Dart, for seventy years, and who died at the age of ninety-six. The eldest son, Charles, was a scholar at Tiverton and Fellow of Balliol, and was Rector of Sarsden and Churchill, Oxon, for many years. He died in 1868. William Brudenell Barter was also educated at Tiverton, whence he went to Westminster and Christ Church, where he rather weakened himself with hard reading. The third brother, Robert Speckott, was at Tiverton, Winchester, and New College, and was for many years the much-loved Warden of Winchester College.

³ The *Ecclesiastic* of August 1852 has an article entitled 'The Barter Tracts and School,' founded on his volume *Tracts in Defence of the Christian Sabbath, the Church, her Priesthood and Sacraments* (London, 1851), containing some fourteen separate publications. In the following year he published six other tracts, the last (in 1858) being *Irreverence the Precursor of Infidelity*.

shone in the management of his parish, and especially in his method of teaching the young, and in his visits to the sick, and was greatly loved both within and outside his parish. His character is well sketched by his son-in-law in his preface to ‘Burghclere Sunday School Exercises.’

The Bishop of St. Andrews, who had been so constantly with him, was naturally present at the funeral at Burghclere, and remained to preach on the Sunday (21 November). The funeral is described as very touching in the outburst of grief which accompanied it. Very affectionate and appreciative letters were also received by members of the family from Pusey and Keble.

At Advent 1858 the Bishop of St. Andrews issued a ‘Supplement to Notes on the Eucharistic Controversy’ of 14 quarto pages, dealing in a very instructive way with the opinions of Bishops Andrewes, Jeremy Taylor, and others, and giving some interesting particulars of the life and works of Professor John Forbes of Corse—justifying him from undue disparagement—and explaining the singular position of Thorndike in 1659. In it he touches mainly upon the authorities quoted in the ‘Appeal’ of Mr. Cheyne, whose case was now heard again. He had unfortunately not been willing to listen to the admonition given to him in November, and on 2 December, as he made no retraction, the judgment of the Bishop of Aberdeen was affirmed by the Episcopal Synod, the Bishop of Brechin protesting. Mr. Cheyne was, therefore, now under sentence of suspension from his office of Presbyter, and did not deny that it was a legal sentence which he was bound to obey.

Notwithstanding this sentence, he continued to officiate as a Deacon, and to do other acts of a pastoral character, though he did not preach, justifying himself by declaring that he had only been suspended as Presbyter, and was still Incumbent of St. John’s Church. He was consequently

again cited before Bishop Suther and the Synod of Aberdeen on the charge of disobedience to the sentence of the Courts, and for a breach of his ordination vow. He was found guilty, and on 27 May, 1859, was adjudged to be no longer a clergyman of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, i.e. to be subject to suspension for an unlimited period. He had, it must be remarked, not only put himself much in the wrong by his contumacy, and by his justification of it by what, to many persons, seemed a quibble, but he had perhaps even more prejudiced his case by a letter to his congregation dated Epiphany 1859 in which he accused the Bishops and all who agreed with them of heterodoxy, if not heresy, and did not even entirely spare Bishop Forbes.¹ He had, however, some legal opinions in his favour.

He appealed, therefore, from the Diocesan Court to the Episcopal Synod, and on 9 November following received its final judgment affirming the sentence of the Court below. The majority, consisting of the Primus (Terrot) and the Bishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow (now Wilson),² acted on

¹ I was able to see a copy of this scarce publication through the kindness of Dr. Danson, when I was at Aberdeen, 23 September, 1896. It is entitled: *A Letter to the Congregation of St. John the Evangelist's, Aberdeen, in answer to their Address, together with the Protest of the Incumbent and Lay Communicants*, by Rev. P. Cheyne, Incumbent of St. John the Evangelist, Aberdeen (Brown & Co. 1859). It seems to sneer at Bishop Forbes for describing his language as 'provocative.' On p. 13 we read: 'The majority of our Bishops have condemned the doctrine which I have taught and you received, and in so doing they have virtually denied the Catholic faith concerning the most sacred mystery of the Eucharist.' On p. 15 he speaks of 'the erroneous doctrine fixed upon (the Church) by the decision of the Bishops.' On pp. 17-18 we read: 'As long as there stands unrevoked a sentence of suspension against a priest for teaching the true doctrine of the Eucharist as the Church has believed it, so long will there remain a standing witness that the Scotch Church is committed to the heterodoxies which received their final sanction on 2 December last.' See also Malcolm McColl's letter to Mr. Gladstone, *Mr. Cheyne and the Bishop of Brechin* (London: Masters, 1860), pp. 16, 20, 24, and Lendrum's *Rights of the Second Order*, p. lxxvii.

² Bishop Trower, who had been particularly eager in the controversy,

the opinion of their legal adviser. The Bishop of Moray (Eden) now joined the Bishop of Brechin in the minority. Bishop Ewing was absent, but would apparently have voted with the majority if he had been present.¹ Bishop Suther could not, of course, vote on such an appeal.

The sentence, though not unexpected, was a severe one, and a few years later Mr. Cheyne made such explanations as were accepted by the Bishops. He explained his contumacy by alleging the ambiguity of the sentence, and asserting that Bishop Suther knew of his ministering as a Deacon for some time before he interfered; and for his doctrinal statements he substituted certain patristic texts. These explanations were tendered in February 1863, and he was formally freed from his deposition. The Bishop of Aberdeen also withdrew his suspension on 18 June of the same year. Mr. Cheyne died, at the age of 85, 18 November, 1878. Bishop Suther died 23 January, 1883.

The year 1859, to which Mr. Cheyne's suspension or deposition belongs, was further saddened for the Bishop of St. Andrews in consequence of the open rupture between himself and the Cathedral clergy and Mr. Lendrum, now Incumbent of Crieff, who was the only Prebendary who had not resigned. Some difficulty would, in any case, probably have arisen when the Bishop came permanently to reside at Perth, and attempted to make the Cathedral in a real sense his own church, but it would not have taken so acute a form apart from the Eucharistic controversy. As time went on the Bishop's part in the latter naturally became more eager, and questions of detail and practice gathered importance in his eyes as expressing certain dis-

had retired early in 1859, and was succeeded by Dean Wilson, who was consecrated Easter Monday, 26 April, in that year, and was, therefore, a new element in these debates.

¹ See Ross's *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, p. 289 foll.

puted points of doctrine. He was constitutionally sensitive and particular, and this will account for his insisting on minutiae in a manner which his opponents described as 'harassing.' But his mind was specially exercised as regards two points, attendance of non-Communicants (including celebration with an insufficient number) and the position of the celebrant—the latter of which controversies was forced by circumstances, both in England and Scotland, into what now seems to most persons very unreasonable prominence.

We must sketch, lightly though it be, the history of these troubles, and for this purpose must turn back a little. The Bishop, as we have seen, came permanently to reside at Perth in April 1856. In May, at his suggestion, certain considerable alterations were made in the ritual of the Cathedral, and he constantly attended the services and preached, though rarely being present at the early celebration. It became the custom at such times to celebrate with only one Communicant, a practice¹ which it was stated he had agreed to sanction in an interview with Provost Fortescue on 23 August, 1853. The Bishop much objected to this, when he heard of it later (at Whitsuntide 1857), and he made a public remonstrance on the subject at a Confirmation on Whit-Tuesday (2 June). This was the beginning of the open conflict, though it did not come to a head for some two years afterwards. The Bishop's fears about the tendency of the ritual at St. Ninian's could not but be intensified by two secessions to Rome—one of the Rev. R. Campbell, who had resigned his Canonical stall in

¹ It is said to have been an old practice of the Scottish Church. See Humble's *Letter* (1859), pp. 8 and 74. This might well be the case in times when the Liturgy was said under severe restrictions. The Bishop's sanction of it was asserted by the Provost (see Appendix I. to Humble's *Letter*, p. 96). It was permitted in Bishop Torry's Prayer Book in cases of necessity.

1856 for lack of income, the other of a lady who was the Provost's principal friend and assistant in the congregation, and who continued to reside in Perth. The conflict gradually became so acute that the parties to it began to consider closely their legal relations to one another, and entered upon a careful examination of the Statutes drawn up by the Bishop in 1853, in order to discover where the power really resided.

In drawing up these Statutes the Bishop had intended to make his position clear and secure, and practically to become Incumbent of the Church,¹ with the Provost as his assistant and deputy when he was absent or otherwise employed. Mr. Boyle's letters, quoted in the foregoing chapter, show that the promoters of the Cathedral were willing to put themselves entirely in his hands; and Mr. Humble acknowledges² that both he and the Provost supposed, in the early years of their relations, that his power was quite uncontrolled. He was not only Visitor and Ordinary, but the Provost, by Article iv. of the Statutes, was to be 'under the Bishop' in his government and management of the Church. But the peculiarly trying temper of Mr. Humble, and the change in the Bishop's own attitude and practice as regards the Eucharist, consequent upon his experience of the controversy and its results—though his actual opinions did not vary much—made this form of close association and divided authority almost impossible.

¹ I have before me a MS. *Memorandum on St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth*, dated February 1885, in which he says, on p. 4: 'In support of the claim which I have mentioned as made by and for the Provost, and against the opposite view which I maintained, it was argued that the latter tended to make the Provost no more than the Bishop's *Curate*. If we take the word *Curate* in its highest signification, it may be admitted that this plea was well founded. But no one is required to accept the office who dislikes such a position; and there can be no question whatever that it is the position clearly and unmistakably defined for the Provost under the constitution of the Cathedral at *Inverness*,' &c.

² In his printed *Letter* (1859), p. 71 *note*.

Nor were the Provost and Precentor quite their own masters, depending so much as they did on the generosity of their two lay supporters.¹

Hence it was not unnatural that in the summer of 1857 they took the opinion of Mr. J. D. Chambers, Recorder of Sarum, well known as a student of Ritual, on three points: (1) whether the Bishop could oblige the Provost to alter the hours of Divine service, a question intended especially to touch the early celebration; (2) whether he could oblige the Provost to take means to prevent persons from assisting at the Holy Eucharist without receiving; (3) whether he could proceed against the Provost or other Canons for continuing to be present in Choir without receiving. They also asked whether the Bishop could claim authority alone to interpret the Statutes. To all these questions Mr. Chambers gave an answer, both general and particular, in the negative,² and this naturally encouraged the members of the Chapter to further resistance. Nevertheless, as we have seen, the Synod of 1858 passed off amicably, with only a passing reference to the resignation of five Prebendaries and to the closing of the Cathedral Grammar School on the resignation of Mr. Sellar.

It was the attempt to re-establish this school without

¹ The Provost had 200*l.* from Hon. G. F. Boyle, and the Precentor 100*l.* from Lord Forbes. Both were supposed to have been secured 'for ever,' but the former sum was not. Mr. Boyle, when Lord Glasgow, largely increased his annual payments in 1869, adding 150*l.* to the Provost, 100*l.* to the Precentor, and 150*l.* for the maintenance of the Cathedral services. In 1878 Lord Forbes undertook the 100*l.* for the Precentor, and Lord Glasgow gave 60*l.* for house rent. All Lord Glasgow's benefactions came to an end in 1885.

² See Mr. Humble's *Letter* (1859), *Appendix F*. Mr. Chambers stated his conclusion in general terms: 'The jurisdiction of the Bishop over the Provost is confined to the enforcement of the Provincial and Diocesan Canons, of the observance of the Liturgy of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, and limited by those Canons and Liturgy' (p. 87). This opinion is dated Lincoln's Inn, 13 August, 1857.

the concurrence and against the will of the Bishop, and the issue of the Cathedral Declaration on the Eucharist,¹ which occasioned the final rupture. The first led to the withdrawal of the Bishop from attendance at the Cathedral (announced 12 May, 1859); the second, which was presented to him on 19 June, made it almost impossible for him to return. This Declaration was indeed so carefully and skilfully worded—consisting of a *cento* of phrases from Holy Scripture, the Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies, and short texts of Fathers and Divines—that it would have been difficult to find any definite independent statement in it. But it was so evidently intended as a reply to the Bishops' first decision in Mr. Cheyne's case that its circulation as a manifesto, signed by all sorts of communicant persons connected with the Cathedral congregation—over a hundred in number²—could not but be interpreted as an attack upon the Bishops in general and the Bishop of St. Andrews in particular. For, rightly or wrongly, the supporters of Mr. Cheyne fixed on the Bishop of St. Andrews almost the whole odium of his condemnation.

The Bishop practically removed his 'throne' to St. John's Church, Perth, and remained closely connected with it till 1866, and, though still resident in Perth, he did not attend the Cathedral except to perform some Episcopal acts, such as Confirmation, for more than twelve years (1859-72).³

The rupture became more pronounced after the pub-

¹ It may be found as *Appendix K* to Mr. Humble's *Letter*, p. 97. It was, I imagine, drawn up by him.

² According to the analysis which the Bishop gives of it elsewhere, it was signed by 105 persons, including 64 females, and 17 boys and girls of and under sixteen years of age. Some of the elder persons were in receipt of alms from the Church.

³ See the MS. *Memorandum* above quoted, p. 5.

lication (at the formal request of the Synod) of his Charge of 13 September, 1859.¹ This dealt rather fully and frankly (perhaps too frankly) with the St. Ninian's Declaration, the Perth Collegiate School, and the postponement of a Confirmation at Crieff in consequence of a newspaper letter and advertisement signed by Mr. Lendrum, and concluded with stating his reasons for ceasing to take the Eastward Position as celebrant at Holy Communion. He had always in Scotland taken this position at the Consecration prayer, and at St. Ninian's had done so from the first Lord's Prayer onwards. The first he had done believing it to be the meaning of the rubric; the second contrary to his own feeling and judgment, but as an act of conciliation. He now had given up both, being persuaded that he had understood the English rubric wrongly. For his later interpretation of the rubric he quotes Wheatley, Blunt (of Cambridge), and Robertson, who thought that the words 'before the table' only referred to the 'ordering' of the elements, and that the priest was then intended to return to the 'north side' or end.² The Bishop's other reason for his change was in order that he might no longer seem to encourage certain views on the doctrine of Sacrifice. He did not, however, intend to enforce his opinion upon those who were unwilling to accept the same view (any more than that on non-recipient attendance) unless the law of the Church required him to do so. The Charge concludes with some sad and affectionate words as to the opposition with which he was met.

¹ This Synod was held at Dunkeld in consequence of the strained relations with the Cathedral Chapter.

² Though practice was largely in favour of this interpretation, grammar seems against it; and certainly, as the Bishop saw, so ambiguous a direction could hardly be quoted as involving penalties if variously interpreted.

It can never be my wish to stand towards any of my clergy in any other relation than that of one whose solemn duty and whose fervent desire it is to work with you, heartily and lovingly, in a common cause—a cause the noblest and most precious that can devolve upon man. And whenever this relation is disturbed—whenever I am precluded from showing the affection which I would fain cherish towards you all—whenever my constant prayer, ‘that we may love as Brethren, being all of one accord and of one mind,’ would seem for a season, in regard to some one or other among you, to return unto me void, the trial and the pain are greater than I can express. It is not merely that my feelings as a man are wounded and my natural sympathies as your spiritual friend and adviser are obstructed and driven back from the course in which they ought to flow; but I lie oppressed under the conviction that nothing which we have to do can prosper as we wish, and that much, very much, which might and ought to be done by us, must be left undone unless we can act together, not only in peace and harmony, but with mutual confidence and esteem (p. 29).

The reply to the Charge was disheartening. It took the form of two pamphlets, appearing almost simultaneously, but after it was known that proceedings would be taken against Bishop Forbes. The first, a ‘Letter’ by Precentor Humble, is a detailed and, it must be said, in some respects able indictment of the Bishop in regard to his whole connection with St. Ninian’s, and particularly in regard to the matters mentioned in his Charge of 1859. It has an appendix of documents arranged in a very convenient manner. But the tone and character of the Letter are exceedingly disagreeable, and sometimes very unworthy of the writer.

The other pamphlet, entitled ‘The Rights of the Second Order of the Clergy,’ and dated Advent 1859, also a letter to the Bishop, was the work of Mr. Lendrum. It was not so able as Mr. Humble’s and more rhetorical, but of the same general character. The author soon afterwards left

the country, and his name will now disappear from this memoir.¹ It is painful to reflect on the waste of time and nervous energy in these and similar effusions, and in the letters written to the newspapers and journals, and the even more painful articles in reviews and periodicals. But in judging of the bitterness of tone manifested at this time we must remember that on 3 October, 1859, notwithstanding negotiations which had gone on with the hope of averting the shock to public opinion, a formal presentment was made against Bishop Forbes by Rev. W. Henderson and two vestrymen of the church of St. Mary's, Arbroath, and that on 9 November Mr. Cheyne received his final sentence from the three Bishops, which removed him for a time from the ranks of the clergy.

On 5 November Bishop Forbes had written a letter to the congregation of St. Paul's, Dundee, of which he was Incumbent, dated from Oxford, where he was engaged with Dr. Pusey in preparing his defence. In it he cites Bishops Ken, Wilson, and Jeremy Taylor as having used more fervid and positive language than he had himself, and stated that in his Charge he had written with a view to the reunion of Christendom, and in a way which he hoped might tone down the acerbities of polemics. The letter was written in Bishop Forbes's usual winning manner, and no doubt made an impression on those who were wondering what the issue might be. Bishop Wordsworth replied to it in a way which was unusual to him—an anonymous pamphlet, apparently intended at the time really to conceal his personality,² entitled 'Proposals for Peace; or, a few

¹ Mr. Lendrum became Rector of Blatherwycke, Dio. Peterborough, and died 14 Jan. 1890.

² By one friend it was conjectured to be my father's work. The letter to my father which mentions this also mentions an anonymous gift of 100*l.*, put into the offertory at Forfar, as 'the humble offering of a sincere Churchman for the Bishop of St. Andrews in token of sympathy,' on Christmas Day 1859. On 5 November, 1871, he writes to his brother (then Bishop of

remarks on the Eucharistic Doctrine of Bishops Taylor, Ken, and Wilson with reference to the recent pastoral of the Bishop of Brechin, with a Postscript on the case of Mr. Cheyne.' In these he showed, as he had several times done already, that these Anglican divines, like St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine in older days, while using fervid and rhetorical language in some places, yet balance, explain, and justify it in others, so as to approach and sometimes to touch what had been stigmatised as 'the theory of virtue and efficacy.' He showed, too, that Ken altered a passage of his 'Practice of Divine Love,' which ran in 1685 'how Thou Who art in Heaven *art present on the altar* I can by no means explain' into 'after what extraordinary manner Thou Who art in Heaven *art present throughout the whole sacramental action to every devout receiver . . .* I cannot comprehend, but I firmly believe *all Thou hast said*' (pp. 5, 6). At the close he calls upon the Bishop of Brechin, who had referred to these three authorities, to accept their teaching *fully and fairly*.

The postscript on the case of Mr. Cheyne is also valuable, especially in its quotations from the Catechisms of Bishop George Innes, of Brechin (used by Bishop Jolly for half a century at Fraserburgh, and practically by Bishop Torry), of Bishop William Abernethy Drummond (of Brechin, and Edinburgh and Glasgow), of Primus John Skinner, and of David Moir, Bishop Forbes's immediate predecessor at Brechin. It should be remembered that Mr. Cheyne had frequently referred to the authority of Bishop Jolly and others in his 'Reasons of Appeal'; hence the quotations from Bishop Innes's Catechism are very much to the point. This Catechism clearly teaches the presence of Christ's

Lincoln) that two bachelor brothers named Stewart, whom he only knew very slightly, members of the congregation of St. John's, Perth, had left him a legacy of 200*l.* apiece, and 500*l.* towards the endowment of the see.

'natural Body and Blood,' and that 'in mystery and signification,' 'in power and virtue,' or 'in power and effect,' or 'in power and efficacy'—this qualifying or explanatory phrase being constantly repeated.

At the same time the Bishop of St. Andrews made indirect communications with the presenters, endeavouring thereby to stave off the trial; and Mr. Gladstone and Sir John Coleridge also used their influence to effect a peaceful settlement.¹ But these efforts failed. It could hardly be expected that the appeal in 'Proposals for Peace' would have much effect on Bishop Forbes, though it could scarcely fail to make him feel that he had spoken very hastily in assuming that Anglican theology, in its general result, justified his expressions. He spent the winter, I believe in Oxford, in preparing his able 'Theological Defence,' which was the joint work of Dr. Pusey, Mr. Keble, and himself.² This 'Defence'—a treatise of 235 pages—was sent in on 7 January, 1860, and when the Synod met on 7 February it was read by the Bishop to the Court on two successive days. Mr. Keble was present then, and on the second day had an interview with the Bishop of St. Andrews, of which the following contemporary note was made in the Bishop's 'Churchman's Almanack':—

8 February.—Interview with Mr. Keble at his request, at Mr. W. Forbes's, in which he took and kissed my hand and begged me to forgive anything he had done amiss in the controversy respecting the Bishop of Br[echin]. We were alone. The interview lasted more than half an hour. We parted lovingly. I trust³ there was no guile on either side. (He had sent a message to me through the Bishop of M[oray?] to ask if I

¹ See my uncle's *MS. Note-book*, v. 17, and Liddon's *Pusey*, iii. 456.

² See Preface to Keble's *Occasional Papers*, p. xxi. note. Cp. Liddon's *Pusey*, iii. 456.

³ I understand this to mean: 'I believe we were both of us sincere.' Keble had been intimate with the Bishop at Winchester.

would allow him to call upon me. But I thought it more proper to go to him.)

On the following day Mr. Henderson read his 'Pleadings,' which was, in its first edition, a pamphlet of eighty-nine pages. The Court then adjourned till 14 March, having fixed 23 February as the day on or before which the Bishop of Brechin should present his printed reply. This consists of fifty-five pages. Between this time and 14 March, when the trial finally came on, attempts were still made to bring the Bishop of Brechin to make such further explanations as would enable the Synod to pass over the matter without definite answer.¹ But they were unsuccessful. On the 14th the 'Reply to the Pleadings' was taken as read, and on the following day judgment was given, the Primus (Bishop Terrot), Bishop Eden, and Bishop Wordsworth reading their opinions. The unanimous finding of the Court was read by Bishop Wilson of Glasgow. Bishop Ewing was again unable to be present, through severe illness. He was averse to any penal sentence, though extremely opposed to Bishop Forbes's views.

The finding of the Court, divested from technicalities, was, that the presentment of Bishop Forbes's teaching (1) on the identity of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist and the Sacrifice of the Cross, and (2) as to the supreme adoration due to Christ's Body and Blood mysteriously present in the gifts, is proven, and that the teaching itself is unsanctioned by the Articles and Formularies of the Church, and to a certain extent inconsistent with them; (3) that the charge of unsoundness as to the reception by the wicked

¹ See Liddon's *Pusey*, iii. 456: 'The Bishop of Brechin was sounded as to the possibility of his putting forth an explanation of his language, which might make it possible for the Synod to confine itself to a brotherly exhortation on the disadvantage of polemical discussion, and several letters passed between him and Pusey in regard to the proposals thus made. But nothing came of this effort.'

is not proven; (4) that the charge of depraving the Articles and Formularies, viz. as to the 'Declaration on Kneeling,' the 'Gloria in Excelsis,' and the 28th Article is partly dealt with in the first finding, and partly unnecessary, since the argument about the 'Gloria in Excelsis' is withdrawn by the Respondent. The judgment ends as follows:—

But in consideration of the explanations and modifications offered by the Respondent in his Answers, in reference to the first Charge, and in consideration that the Respondent now only asks for toleration of his opinions, but does not claim for them the authority of the Church, or any right to enforce them on those subject to his jurisdiction: we, the said College of Bishops, feel that we shall best discharge our duty in this painful case by limiting our sentence to a Declaration of Censure and Admonition.

And we do now solemnly admonish, and in all brotherly love entreat the Bishop of Brechin to be more careful for the future, so that no fresh occasion may be given for trouble and offence, such as have arisen from the delivery and publication of the Primary Charge to his clergy complained of in the Presentment.

At this point it will be convenient to the reader to have before him the Bishop of St. Andrews' own remarks upon the controversy as far as his own special part in it was concerned.¹

One of my saddest experiences arising out of our Eucharistic controversy was that it caused on my part a breach—if so I may call it, when there had never been more than a slight personal acquaintance—with Dr. Pusey. He took upon himself to write to me in dictatorial terms, which I could not but feel to be quite uncalled for. It was a painful thing for me to have to sit as a judge upon a brother Bishop, and especially such a one as Bishop Forbes, and I did what I properly could by indirect communication with the presenters to stave off the trial; but when there was no escape from the duty I set myself to discharge it with the utmost conscientiousness. I prepared an elaborate

¹ From his *MS. Note-book*, v. 17 foll.

judgment, which lasted, I think, not less than two or three hours in the delivery, and, in order to be fortified with the best opinion I could obtain, on the day before the trial came on I went to Burntisland and requested Mr. G. Forbes, the Bishop's brother, who was known to have made a special study of the Eucharist, to do me the favour to read carefully what I had written, and to give me the benefit of any suggestions he would wish to offer for its correction or improvement. He did so; and in returning the MS. assured me unreservedly, and with emphasis quite beyond what I had ventured to expect, that he went along with me in every word.

As regards the controversy itself I take the following paragraphs from different note-books, sometimes supplying necessary words in square brackets, sometimes omitting what is incomplete or superfluous, but otherwise giving the Bishop's own expressions, unrevised as they sometimes are. On further revision I believe he would have guarded against the inference which might be drawn from the last sentence.

What was the question at stake? [It centred round the doctrine of the] Real Presence—an ambiguous expression, unknown to the New Testament, and [it is] unfortunate that it was ever introduced.

[The Church teaches] a Presence [of Christ] :—

1. In the individual Christian, when in Baptism he is made a member [of Christ].
2. In the Church at large as Christ's mystical Body.
3. In meetings of Christians for Public worship.
4. In the consecration of Bread and Wine to become Christ's sacramental Body and Blood.

Is there in this last a Presence so far more real and different from all the rest that it involves a Presence on the altar in the elements (1) which ought to be adored, (2) which involves a repetition or continuation of the Sacrifice of the Cross? This is what the advocates of the new doctrine of the Real Objective Presence maintained [and] which our Church, by its highest and purely spiritual Tribunal, denied. [In doing so it acted in union with the] opinion of my predecessor, Bishop Torry, the Champion of the Scottish Office and the Scotch tradition of the High

Church School; [and in agreement with the] opinion of Dr. Routh, President of Magdalen College for [63] years [1791–1854], the learned representative of the Anglican tradition of the Highest Church School [of the generation previous to my own]. Now there is no getting over the argument from the fact that the most eminent of the Fathers again and again [not only] speak of the consecrated elements as the Body and Blood of Christ—but also as symbols of the Body and Blood. A symbol of a thing may be called the thing itself, as we say of a portrait that it is Mr. So-and-So.¹ But the thing itself cannot be called a symbol (MS. v. 41, 49).

As regards the doctrine of the Sacrifice, he expresses himself thus, the point being substantially one which had struck him at once on reading the Charge, as he said at the Episcopal Synod of 1857, that it disturbed the proportion of the faith especially as regards our Lord's Ascension and the coming of the Holy Ghost.

The doctrine of the Session [of our Lord Jesus Christ] at the right hand of God, plainly taught in no less than a dozen passages of the New Testament, involving [not only] (1) perpetual intercession, [but also] (2) [sending down the Holy Spirit to dwell in His Church], (3) [acceptance of our gifts and presentation of them to the Father], and (4) [feeding His people on His Sacrifice], has been swallowed up by the notion of a continuous Sacrifice carried on in Heaven, as though the great Sacrifice on the Cross had been grudgingly accepted, or can be held to be less than perfect. The notion has arisen out of the prestige which it gives to the priesthood of the Clergy; but it has no foundation in the word of God, and, as I have said, it obliterates the doctrine which has abundant foundation in that word (MS. iii. 114).

¹ This is a well-known illustration used by St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa* III. quaest. 83, art. 1: 'Utrum in hoc sacramento Christus immoletur.' His doctrine on the Sacrifice is certainly what would now be called Low Church doctrine. He says, we may say that Christ is 'immolated' in the Sacrament (1) because it is a representative image of the Passion of Christ; (2) because through it we are made partakers of the fruits of the Lord's Passion. For Bishop Torry's opinion see Neale's *Life*, p. 377. Cp. also Cosin, *Works*, iv. p. 207.

I confess I do not like the notion (now so popular) of our Lord's pleading His Sacrifice.¹ It seems to clash with the doctrine of the Session. . . . The one Sacrifice on the Cross was full, perfect, and sufficient: the pleading of it seems to suggest either that the Sacrifice was insufficient or grudgingly accepted. . . . That *we* on Earth should plead it in prayers and Eucharists is right and natural (MS. iii. 121).

In other passages he deals with the Liturgical developments respecting the Melchizedekian Priesthood and the celestial altar, which have been struck out or passed over by our Reformed Church, but are now 'insisted upon by the Tractarians.' In regard to Heb. viii. 3, if we are to translate it with Bengel and Westcott '*it was necessary that this man have somewhat to offer*' it refers (he says) to the Sacrifice of the Cross. If we are to follow our authorised and revised versions—'*it is necessary*' &c.—then it refers to Christ's offerings of *our* prayers and *our* pleadings of the one great all sufficient Sacrifice when He intercedes for us at the right hand of God. This is the meaning, too, of the celestial altar in the Apocalypse. It is an altar of incense, on which is offered the incense of Christ's intercession added to the prayers of the saints. The 'other angel' (Rev. viii. 3) is Christ.

And all the teaching that Christ in some way repeats or continues and pleads His own Sacrifice upon the heavenly altar has no foundation in Holy Scripture (MS. v. 28, 29).

It is fair to the Bishop of St. Andrews to exhibit part of this argument in fuller detail from his unpublished '*Opinion,*' pp. 19, 20.

¹ The teaching that Christ pleads His Sacrifice is not a modern one in the Church of England, nor specially connected with Sacerdotalism. It is embodied in well-known hymns of the last century, and I find it stated, with other similar points, in an interesting sermon of Henry Melvill's on Heb. viii. 2, *Christ the Minister of the Church*, which has many points of contact with doctrine usually connected with the Oxford Movement. See his *Sermons*, ed. 2 (1834), pp. 35-65, and esp. pp. 50 foll.

Christ, as He was a Priest over the true Israel, was a Priest typified by Aaron and his descendants. As such, He made once for all the great Atonement. As such, He ascended into the true Holy of Holies, i.e. into Heaven itself, 'by His own Blood' (observe it is not said '*with* his own Blood,' but 'by' *διὰ*, (Heb. ix. 12) there 'to appear in the presence of GOD for us' (Heb. ix. 24). This was the final completion at once of the time of His Humiliation, and of His Aaronical Priesthood. Henceforth He became both *a King for ever* and *a Priest for ever*. And as a Priest for ever, He is a Priest after the order of Melchizedek. Wherefore, according to the strict and proper interpretation of His Melchizedekian Office, as actually set forth in Holy Scripture and unravelled from its intertexture with the Levitical, our Lord is no longer a Priest who has to deal with victims, or with the making of atonement. No; He does only what Melchizedek did. First, He receives, in GOD'S name, and in GOD'S behalf, our tithes—that is, a type of our Alms, our Oblations, our Souls and Bodies, of all that we have and are. Again, He blesses the most High GOD, in our name, and in our behalf—that is, He presents our praises and Eucharists at the Throne of Grace. These are the Sacrifices—the only Sacrifices that are specified in the Epistle to the Hebrews (see xiii. 15, 16), and doubtless they include the Eucharistic Sacrifice in all its parts: for, as it is written in the same place (verse 10), 'we have an altar, &c.'¹ Above all, He brings forth bread and wine—His gifts of Grace, His Benedictions, and His Sacraments, most especially that precious and most comfortable Sacrament of His own Body and Blood, wherewith, as from 'the Altar,' He feasts us, i.e. all who are the true sons of Abraham, as we return from the slaughter of our Spiritual Enemies, and at the same time enables us to become still more victorious. And this He does 'for ever': not after the order of a transitory Priesthood such as Aaron's, but of Melchizedek—a Priesthood which the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has summed up in one word, where he says that 'He ever liveth to make intercession for us' (Heb. vii. 23). He stands between us and GOD, both to give and to receive (so far I would accept the Respondent's statement that 'Our Lord's intercession is an act of not mere prayer; but

¹ *Original Note.* See St. Ignatius, quoted *Answers*, p. 28, and Irenaeus, *ib.* p. 33 seq.

of oblation'): to receive as Priest to GOD-ward to give as King to us-ward; or rather—for we may not separate the two, even in thought—to execute at once a Royal Priesthood and a Priestly Royalty. He does this *in Heaven*; He has continued to do it from the day of Pentecost, when, in token of His established sacerdotal Kingship, He sent down the Holy Ghost to abide in His stead with His Church on earth; while He Himself occupies, for our sake no less than for His own, the Seat of Glory which He has won at the Father's Right Hand; according as it is written in that same 110th Psalm, 'The Lord said unto my Lord, sit Thou on My Right Hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool.' Here, then, we see no room left for any identity between the Sacrifice of the Eucharist and the Sacrifice of the Cross—our Lord's so-called Melchizedekian Sacrifice of Himself, which served as the connecting link¹ between the two, being altogether taken away. I do not absolutely say of Melchizedek, 'Sacrificium nullum obtulit' [as Bishop Andrewes did] because I am aware that many of the Fathers, after St. Cyprian, have said otherwise; but I do say (and I reverence and admire the silence of Holy Scripture in this respect) that as regards the Type and Antitype of Melchizedek, the notion of a Sacrifice otherwise than Eucharistical is not Scriptural.

I must now redeem my promise to state, as shortly as possible, my own judgment on this mysterious and solemn subject. I will first make a few preliminary observations.

I agree with the Bishop of St. Andrews that the general criticism to be passed upon the views on Eucharistic Adoration and Eucharistic Sacrifice, which are the main subject of this controversy, by whomsoever they are put forward, is that they 'disturb the proportion of the faith.'

The Holy Eucharist is a great act of worship as well as a means of grace, but it is worship primarily and

¹ *Original Note.* See *Answers*, p. 72: 'The Sacrifice here below is part of His own Melchizedekian Priesthood. He invisibly consecrates. He invisibly offers. He now, too, in St. Augustine's words, is the Offerer and Oblation.' For the true meaning of these words of St. Augustine, see *Notes of the Eucharistic Controversy*, pp. 12 and 47, and below p. 48, note.

specially addressed to the Father as representing the Blessed Trinity, through the Son, by the power of the Holy Ghost. To make so much of Eucharistic worship addressed to the presence of Christ, as distinct from the Almighty Father, is seriously to withdraw men's finite minds from the main object of their assembling together. Our minds are so constituted that they cannot think adequately of more than one thing at a time, and if we press, as a great duty, one species or detail of Adoration, we occupy the mind and so practically negative (though of course we do not verbally deny) the fitting and proper attention which they ought to pay to the other and the principal end of their worship.

In the next place, so-called logical teaching as to the presence—such as Bishop Forbes and Mr. Cheyne enforced—is justly feared and suspected in this country on account of its medieval associations. It is a characteristic of that scholastic theology, which dominated the unreformed Church from the twelfth century onwards, to drive its conclusions to extremes and so to become disproportionate, when not absolutely heretical. This was a matter of comparatively less importance when the controversies so raised were free to run their course and were confined to the schools. If the controversy on Transubstantiation, for instance, had been let alone by authority, as that on Ubiquity was in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it would have made its proper contribution to thought and then have passed into the background. Unfortunately, in the unreformed Church the scholastic temper was, for a time, united to a commanding position and a legal and lawgiving instinct in its centre, the Church of Rome. As far, therefore, as that Church was able to give laws to Christendom it set itself to achieve two tasks: first, to make everything as plain and definite as possible; and secondly, to make discipline easy and so to limit contro-

versy. The second end was attained by making conciliar definitions, which were sometimes only arrived at by secondary processes of logic, necessary articles of faith to be accepted under pain of anathemas. Rome acted, in fact, upon the principle that a thing must either be wrong or right, a proposition either false or true. And it held, further, that if the matter were a religious one, the view taken must either be tremendously and eternally wrong and false, or tremendously and eternally right and true. Thus the old fallacy of the Stoics came in some degree to be repeated that all faults are equal, 'omnia peccata paria'; and the great truth was forgotten that truths arrived at by human logic are almost necessarily incomplete. A half-truth is in one sense a truth, but relatively it may be a most dangerous error.

Hence those who resisted the claims of logic put forward at this time, did so with a sense that they were resisting a feature of Roman theology, which has been the cause of a great deal of the misery of the Church, whether it is described as 'unscriptural' or 'being wise above that which is written,' or as substituting the developments of theological dogma for the more general vague and mysterious teaching of the Primitive Church.

It is easy to say, e.g. Christ is either present or absent; if present He is certainly to be worshipped; and if present He must be present in His whole and perfect personality, at once human and Divine, passible and glorified, otherwise you are guilty of Nestorianism—that is, of believing in two personalities in Christ. Such logic can best, I think, be met by considerations of the broader aspects of the mystery to which the argument is applied, such as that which I have stated at the outset, and by others akin to it, especially by developing the thought that the Eucharist is a great act of worship presented to the eternal Father

through the Son, and by recollecting that we have very imperfect knowledge of the condition of Christ's existence in the unseen world. Those who have tried to make the mystery plain have shown that they were quite lost in the attempt, by resorting to the substitute, for the teaching of a presence of virtue and efficacy which they censured, or of a presence of Christ's Person in some of its attributes apart from others, of an equally unintelligible doctrine of a supra-local presence. Indeed, if you consider them as explanations, one has very little advantage over the other.

Personally I am more inclined, than the Bishop of St. Andrews at this time was, to look hopefully to the theology which makes much of the symbolic language of Scripture and the Fathers about the eternal Priesthood and the celestial altar. I shrink, indeed, from accepting the extreme statement of the identity of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist with the Sacrifice of the Cross, which was surely made unwisely—and in forgetfulness of the priest's true part in Sacrifice, namely, the application and presentation of the Blood, especially within the veil—in some measure by the Council of the Lateran and more explicitly by that of Trent, and by others who have used their language. But I cannot think that our Lord, as our Priest for ever, can divest Himself of His attitude as a Sacrifice for sin when He intercedes for us on High. I do not think that it is a sufficient criticism to say that this mode of speaking implies that the Sacrifice is insufficient or is grudgingly accepted. The relation of the Persons of the Blessed Trinity to one another is indeed absolutely inscrutable, but if Our Lord can be spoken of as 'the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world' (Apoc. xiii. 8), and if He stands in the Vision of Patmos in the midst of the throne—no doubt in fulness of life and power—'as a Lamb that hath been slain' (Apoc. v. 6, 12),

this seems to make the attitude of His pleading the Sacrifice something more than temporary. It is also to be remembered that there are evidently two altars in heaven, one of sacrifice and one of incense, as in the Tabernacle and Temple. For the symbolism of the souls of those that have been slain in martyrdom crying under the altar, of Apoc. vi. 9, can only refer to the altar of sacrifice and not to that of incense. It is evidently taken from the ritual of the old covenant in which the blood (that is the soul or life, Hebrew *nephesh*) of sin offerings was poured under the altar (Lev. iv. 7 &c.) or at its base, and it is to be connected with the imagery of the life-giving stream issuing from under the altar as described by Ezekiel (xlvii. 1) and as repeated in the last chapter of the Apocalypse (xxii. 1), where it proceeds from out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. All these things are figures which must not be pressed in detail (as when we read in several places of our Lord's *sitting* at the right hand of God, and in another of His *standing*), but the whole body of them taken together means at least this, I imagine, that in the heart of God the attributes of Justice and Love are working side by side, pleading, as it were, one against another, and will so work, united by the bond of the Holy Spirit, at least to the end of time.

I should not shrink, then, from saying that Christ still pleads His Sacrifice as our great High Priest, and that the worship of the Eucharist is a union of the worship of earth with that of heaven. Rather, however, I would urge those who teach this to remember that His position as a Priest is higher than His position as a Victim. It is a broader conception and it is freer from any possible tendency to localise and limit the Presence, and so does not lead to the confusion of the sign and the thing signified, which may become practically a source of Idolatry. It reminds us of the great truth, which makes the

Eucharist always and essentially a sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving, that our Lord is *living*, and that we come to meet a risen and ascended Saviour. This is a truth very apt to be forgotten if we turn merely to the symbolic expressions of His Passion.

To my own mind Eucharistic adoration, in the limited and special sense in which it is addressed to Christ, is more truly understood by the Greek Church, which adores specially when the elements are brought in to the sanctuary, and again as a prelude to reception of the Communion,¹ than by the Roman, which attaches adoration to the moment of Consecration—and more by Bishop Andrewes and Bishop Wm. Forbes, who speak of adoration of Christ ‘in the Sacrament’ or ‘in the Eucharist,’ than by those who speak of it as ‘in the gifts.’² The fuller expression, both verbal and practical, is surely the nobler as well as the safer. There is something open to the charge of materialism in the ringing of a bell to call wandering attention to a particular moment when a certain tribute of religious feeling is due. Bishop A. P. Forbes of course would have shrunk from this, but his teaching leads naturally to it.

Again as to the charge of Nestorianism made against those who demur to the teaching as to the Presence ‘in the gifts’ of Christ’s body, soul, and Divinity, while I feel that it is perilous to enlarge upon such a point in one direction or the other, I cannot help remembering that there is a parallel distinction surely to be made between the Presence

¹ See my *Considerations on Public Worship*, &c., p. 21, 1898.

² There is a passage from Bishop Beveridge, *On Frequent Communion*, p. 107, quoted by Forbes, *Charge*, 2nd ed. p. xi., which seems to me to show just the difference between his point of view and that of the older Anglicans: ‘How can I, by faith, behold my Saviour coming to me, and offering to me His own Body and Blood, and not fall down and worship Him?’ &c. The Presence is that of Christ as Minister of the Sacrament rather than in the consecrated species, of Christ the giver rather than of Christ in the gifts.

of Christ in Paradise and His Divine Presence on the throne of God. The penitent robber was at once with Jesus in Paradise. St. Paul speaks of death as to depart and be 'with Christ.' Yet the beatific vision is something still in prospect for dwellers in Paradise, and even, as we Anglicans believe, for the greatest Saints. There is a sense, then, in which our Saviour can be present, for certain purposes—which may be described by the words 'grace and efficacy,' 'virtue and power'—without being present in the fulness of His Godhead. I do not dogmatise as to whether this is so or not in the Eucharist, but I shrink from the hard words used by those who speak of the doctrine of a 'Real Presence of grace and efficacy' as if it was only a subterfuge for a 'Real Absence.'¹ This is not the caution and moderation of a large theology or of a loving charity which makes the best of the opinions of our brother Christians who are trying to speak rightly of an inscrutable mystery.

I will only add one point in conclusion. We have noticed several times the tacit transition made by those who assert the identity of the two sacrifices, from the Sacrifice of the Cross to that of the Upper Room. This shows a defective apprehension of the meaning of language. It would surely have been far better if Bishop Forbes could have confessed that he had spoken somewhat hastily on this point. If he had said 'the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is the repetition of the Sacrifice of the Upper Room as far

¹ The phrase 'Real Absence' is sometimes attributed to Bishop A. P. Forbes. My uncle, however, in a letter to Rev. J. S. Wilson (of Edinburgh), 23 April, 1888, attributes it to his brother George. The story is, that when he appealed to the House of Lords in regard to the Scottish Office, he made a speech some five hours long, and completely mystified the judges. One of them—perhaps Lord Westbury—interposed: 'I am not sure that I quite follow your argument, Mr. Forbes; but as I understand it, you appear to be contending for the doctrine of the Real Presence.' 'O no, my Lord, quite the contrary,' was his reply; 'my contention is in favour of the doctrine of the Real Absence.'

as human power can be authorised by God to make it, and bears a relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross similar to that which the Sacrifice of the Upper Room possesses,' the wisest of his opponents would have agreed with him. Unfortunately, instead of making concessions of this sort, he added this sentence in a longer passage in the second edition: 'Our Lord said this *is* my Body; and no words of man can strengthen the tremendous and absolute identity of the two Sacrifices, or rather, as I should prefer to say, of the one Sacrifice in its two aspects' (ed. ii. p. 42). Then in the next paragraph but one he quotes St. Chrysostom, as if he was in agreement with him: 'It is the same which Christ gave to His disciples which is now made by His priests.'

It is difficult for a Bishop to confess that he has been in the wrong; and doubtless Forbes had a hope and desire to show to our fellow-Christians on the continent, with some of whom he was intimate—as with the learned and loveable Gallican Professor Garcin de Tassy, whom I once had the pleasure of visiting in Paris, and who then spoke warmly about him—that the Church in this country is in many things nearer to their own than they had imagined. I am far from thinking that the result of the controversy was mere disputation. Many thought more clearly in consequence, and God brought good out of evil; but there was much distraction of energy, and it is difficult to imagine that Presbyterians were not alienated and the day of Home Reunion postponed.

I may add here that in 1859, when Sir G. C. Lewis was Home Secretary, the claims of Bishop Wordsworth were put forward, and it was hoped that he might become Principal of St. Andrews. Professor James D. Forbes of Edinburgh was, however, appointed. I have before me a letter from the latter, dated 16 November, thanking my uncle for his congratulations as specially gratifying under the circumstances.

CHAPTER V

FIRST PART OF RESIDENCE AT PERTH—REUNION WORK—
1860—1867

‘Making his hardest task his best delight.’—W. WORDSWORTH, *Eccl. Sonnets*,
ii. 16.

Resolution to hold a General Synod carried in 1859—Its constitution—Committee on Canons—Bishop Eden chosen Primus (1862)—Meetings in 1862–63—Canon on Episcopal elections—Bishop Wordsworth offers his resignation—Work of the Synod.

Continuation of Reunion work—Revival in the Establishment—Dr. R. Lee, Principal Tulloch, Dr. N. Macleod, Dr. Bisset—Removal of clerical disabilities in 1864—Commemoration Addresses by Bishop of St. Andrews, 1860, 1861, and 1862—Charges of 1863, 1864—Dr. Caird and Dr. Pirie—Dr. Rorison’s attempt at a Reunion Conference—Synodal Address in 1866—Chichester sermon (Euodias and Syntyche), 1867.

Parallel attempts to use opportunities of educational changes—Advantages of Scotland as to Elementary Education—Act of 1696—Act of 1861—Attempt at ‘A Common Catechism’: not published—‘A National Catechism,’ 1864—Charges of 1872—Call for united action in this matter.

The Bishop’s Greek Grammar adopted by the Head Masters of England (1866)—‘Shakespeare’s Knowledge and Use of the Bible’ (1864), and other Shakesperian publications—Foundation of St. Andrews School Chapel at Perth (1866)—Closer intercourse with England useful, but not wholly favourable to Reunion Movement—Archbishop Longley at Inverness (1866)—Charles Wordsworth at Consecration of Bishop Claughton (1867), at Lambeth Conference (September 1867), at Chichester (November 1867)—Suspension of his efforts for fifteen years.

Domestic events—Death of Kenneth Wordsworth (1862)—Death of Warden Barter (1861)—Bishop Hamilton’s generosity (1864).

IN the following chapter I propose to record the chief events of the second period of Bishop Charles Wordsworth’s Episcopate, which succeeded the close of the Eucharistic

controversy in 1860 down to the end of the year 1867, the year of the first Lambeth Conference.

At the annual Episcopal Synod held 9 November, 1859, the Bishop of St. Andrews had moved for a General Synod for the purpose of the revision of the canons, and his motion was successful. Those who are not familiar with the internal government of the Church in Scotland will need to be informed that this was by no means an every-day event. While the Episcopal Synod meets every year, and more often if necessary, and each Bishop likewise summons the clergy of his Diocese round him once a year, a General or (as it has been called since 1890) a Provincial Synod can only be called by a special resolution of the Episcopal Synod. When summoned it consists, like our own Convocations, of Bishops and Presbyters¹ meeting in two Chambers; but, unlike them, it has no existence in the intervals between one time of its assemblage and the next.

Such an assembly has in fact been created only in the present century, and has been from various causes obstructed in its development, a fact which is naturally criticised by members of the Established Church, who are accustomed to be governed almost entirely by public assemblies. There is no provision respecting it in the oldest code of special Scottish canons, the 'Sixteen Canons'

¹ The second Chamber consists of the Deans of the various Dioceses (not Cathedrals), the Principal of the Theological College, now at Edinburgh, and the Pantonian Professor (if they are different persons), and one representative Presbyter for every ten or fraction of ten Presbyters entitled to vote in each Diocesan Synod. This Chamber elects a Prolocutor and a Pro-prolocutor. No canon can be altered, abrogated, or adopted, except by a majority in both Chambers of the Provincial Synod; but the body has no judicial powers. Possibly the example of the General Assembly, which from time to time spends much of its energy in judicial business, has deterred the Episcopal Church from entrusting such powers to its Provincial Synod. But more probably the prepossession in favour of the authority of Episcopal judges has been even more powerful in this matter. For general details see *Year Book of S. E. C.* (1894), p. 50.

of 1743. The 'Twenty-six Canons' of 1811 provide for General Synods when they are needed 'to alter the Code of Canons.' An attempt was indeed made in 1828 to secure their regular meeting, and a resolution was passed that this should take place every fifth year. But the decision of the Synod of Laurencekirk to that effect was rescinded the next year at Edinburgh (1829), mainly under the influence of Bishop Jolly, who was afraid of any diminution of the Episcopal prerogative.¹ It was not indeed till 1843 that the Episcopal Synod itself was required to meet annually. When it does so it can determine by a majority whether the Provincial Synod shall be summoned or not.

In preparation, then, for this important gathering a mixed committee of clergy and laity was appointed in 1859 to report upon the existing canons; and the Bishop of St. Andrews naturally threw himself heartily into its work during the years that followed. But an event happened before the Synod met which necessarily disconcerted him not a little.

In March 1862 Bishop Terrot resigned his office as Primus, though he retained his position as Bishop of Edinburgh for ten years with the assistance of a coadjutor, dying quite worn out in April 1872. Both Bishop Forbes and Bishop Wordsworth had supporters in the College of Bishops; and there could hardly be a doubt which of them was the abler man; but the friends of the former, finding they would be outvoted, withdrew in favour of Bishop Eden, and so obtained the votes of Bishops Wilson and Suther, who would otherwise have voted for Wordsworth. It was naturally a serious and I may say a lifelong disappointment to the latter, who justly felt that he could have made something of the position, especially in the direction of Reunion. The new Primus, with whom he was on very friendly terms,

¹ See Dean W. Walker's *Life of Bishop Jolly*, ed. 2, p. 128, 1878.

though not a great scholar, was an able, generous, active, and popular man, with many friends and few (if any) enemies. He was about two years older than his colleague, and was a senior student at Christ Church while he was a junior student, and they had many points besides their college in common.

Like Charles Wordsworth he was a great athlete in his youth, and retained a good deal of the boyish spirit and temper; as a man he was possessed with a similar spirit of foundation, and he had interests considerably broader than those of the communion of which he had become a Bishop. His great foundation was Inverness Cathedral, on which he spent a large part of his fortune. His breadth of sympathy was shown in his gifts to foreign missions, especially to Newfoundland, and in his attempts to promote a good understanding with the Russian Church. He was also, like my uncle, a strong advocate for extending the influence and position of laymen in the Church and its Councils, and he may perhaps be considered the founder of the Representative Church Council. He also did much to establish closer relations with England; yet at the same time he was a defender of the Scottish Office. He died in 1886.¹

The election of a Primus took place on 5 July, 1862, and the General Synod sat from the 8th to the 11th, and then adjourned to 30 September. On 3 October it again adjourned till 3 February of next year. On the last of these occasions the Bishop of St. Andrews withdrew from the discussion because a new rule was introduced into the canons which he considered, not without some reason, might be interpreted as a reflection upon himself. This new rule prohibited a clergyman from voting at his own

¹ The best printed account of Bishop Eden is that in Rev. John Archibald's *The Historic Episcopate in the Columban Church and in the Diocese of Moray*, Edinb. 1893, pp. 325-363.

election ; but it did not contain the provision which (as he urged) was laid down in the old Canon Law, that if the votes were equal an elector, who assented to his own election, had a right to be preferred to one who was not an elector. As this was the ground on which some of the Bishops who confirmed his own election specially relied, it was natural that he should regret that no notice of this principle should be taken in the new canon. He resolved, on this account, to offer his resignation ; but this was so strongly deprecated by his brother Bishops and the clergy and laity of his own Diocese, that he withdrew from his intention to take this step.¹

The principal changes in the canons then enacted were admission of lay representatives to vote in elections of Bishops ; the admission of assistant curates and mission clergy of a certain standing to Diocesan Synods ; the restriction of clerical vestments to those now in use ; and the removal of the Scottish Office from its position of primary authority, and the adoption of the English Book of Common Prayer as the service-book of the Church.²

During the years which immediately succeeded the close of the Eucharistic controversy a number of circumstances combined to give new life and hopes to the Church in Scotland, and especially to encourage the movement towards Reunion. Charles Wordsworth's main contributions to it consisted of various discourses and addresses, which he linked with the special commemorations which fell in those years, and of an attempt to make use of the opportunities offered by the changes in public educational policy which began in 1861. There was at the same time a revival in

¹ The circumstances are fully set out in his printed *Letter to Dean Torry*, dated 19 February, 1863. See also above, p. 8.

² See further in W. Stephen's *History*, ii. 644 (1896). The treatment of the Scottish Office has been already discussed : see above, pp. 76-7.

the Established Church of Scotland, which had struggled bravely, and to a great extent effectually, to recover the ground lost in consequence of the great disruption of 1843. The old bitterness and suspicion were also to some extent disappearing, and many of the methods of the Episcopal Churches were making themselves at home among Presbyterians. The reader may be recommended to study several interesting chapters in the biographies of Dr. Robert Lee and Principal Tulloch,¹ which deal in the first case with 'Scotch Episcopacy' and the Conference proposed by Dr. Rorison, and with 'The Church Service Society,' and in the second with 'The Renaissance of the Scotch Church.' Dr. Lee, of Greyfriars, Edinburgh, though a somewhat severe critic of Episcopalianism, and even of the Prayer Book, was, as is well known, the champion in the Establishment of Liturgical development and other so-called 'innovations,' and especially of fixed forms of prayer, for which he gained at least toleration. This he effected at last at the cost of a severe and prolonged struggle, entailing much personal suffering, at the close of which he died—14 March, 1868. The following sentence from a speech of his at the Synod of Lothian, 1 May, 1866, attracted the Bishop's attention, and is worth quoting as a type of Dr. Lee's downright mode of argument.

Then they were told that they were all sworn to maintain uniformity; but what was the uniformity they were bound to maintain? When he became a minister in 1833 it was almost the universal custom not to use the Lord's Prayer and not to

¹ See Dr. R. H. Story's *Life and Remains of Robert Lee, D.D.*, i. chaps. 3 and 4 (Lond. 1870), and Mrs. Oliphant's *Memoir of Principal Tulloch*, chap. 8 (3rd ed. Lond. 1889). See also Dr. Lee's important book, *The Reform of the Church of Scotland in Worship, Government, and Doctrine*. Part I. *Worship*, Edinb. 1864. His remarks on the Prayer Book may be found in that volume, pp. 170-179, and some harsher criticisms in the *Life*, ii. 99-107.

read the Scriptures in public worship. He never for a moment felt himself bound in conscience to comply with a uniformity like that.

Principal Tulloch (who afterwards became a real friend of Bishop Wordsworth, during his settlement at St. Andrews), was a yet broader-minded man, and would gladly have seen Episcopacy introduced as a practical improvement into his own communion, though not seeing his way clearly as to the manner. He distinguished himself at this time by his freedom in dealing with the Westminster Confession and the two Catechisms. Dr. Norman Macleod also provoked a storm at Glasgow by a protest against rigid Sabbatarianism. The nearest approach to a better understanding from the Presbyterian side was made, however, not by Lee or Tulloch, but by Dr. Bisset in his address as Moderator to the General Assembly of 1862, in which he spoke out bravely, though in general terms, of the duty of unity and conciliation. ‘No considerable progress,’ he said, ‘will probably be made in what should be a supreme object of longing supplication to every follower of Christ—the unification of His Church—until different Communion in a spirit of humility and charity concur in a revision of their religious constitutions.’ To the disruption, and to schism generally, he traced a decline in morals; and spoke of the decay of faith which made it the duty of all Christians ‘to coalesce and combine for the good of our Church and country.’ In passing, too, he showed marked sympathy with the services of the Church of England, and consequently with the ‘innovations’ of which Dr. Lee was the champion. No wonder that the latter wrote in his diary under 2 June (1862): ‘This evening Dr. Bisset, the Moderator, concluded the Assembly with an extraordinary address, approving innovations and suggesting more. I never expected to hear such things in the General

Assembly, much less from the Moderator's chair' ('Life,' ii. 32).

The year 1864 brought added strength to the Episcopal Church through the removal of clerical disabilities by the Act of Parliament (27 & 28 Vict. cap. 94) which was carried mainly by the exertions of the Duke of Buccleuch and Sir William Heathcote, assisted of course by Mr. Gladstone.¹ Many persons in Scotland naturally interested themselves in this matter, the most prominent perhaps being the new Primus, Bishop Eden² (whose personal friendship with the Duke is said to have largely influenced the success of the measure), and Bishop Ewing.³ The latter, characteristically enough, wrote to his friend, Bishop A. C. Tait, of London, urging that the concession should be conditionally limited in its duration, and especially should contain a provision adverse to the extended use of his constant object of criticism, the Scottish Office. The Bill, however, was carried without conditions of this sort, and under it clergy of the Episcopal Church are eligible for offices and benefices in England, with the special consent, however, of the Bishop of the Diocese. The substantial unity of the two bodies is thus manifested.

There was a certain soreness on the subject among members of the Established Church, which clings to the idea of its parity with the Church of England, and especially in the mind of Dr. Lee. But the opposition came to nothing, and the occasion for a call to union on the north of the Tweed was naturally not lost sight of. The Bishop of St. Andrews

¹ See some letters of Bishop A. P. Forbes to him on this subject in Mackey's *Forbes*, pp. 130–132.

² Some notes on this point will be found in John Archibald's *Historic Episcopate in the Columban Church and in the Diocese of Moray*, pp. 334, 336, 341. Bishop Eden's father-in-law, Mr. Justice James Allan Park, was also keenly interested in the Bill.

³ See Ross's *Memoir*, p. 362. The letter is dated 15 January, 1864.

had been vigorously using the commemorations of the previous years to enforce his own conceptions on Reunion. At the close of the year 1860 he had delivered an elaborate discourse on the tercentenary of the first meeting of the General Assembly at Edinburgh (20 December, 1560). This was given at St. Andrews 18 December, at Dunfermline 19 December, and at Perth 22 December. His object was to show that the first Scottish Reformers, like the English, appealed to primitive antiquity, of which of course he was now a skilled exponent, and consequently to advocate a union between the Established Churches in England and Scotland without sacrifice of national independence.¹

Similar thoughts occupied his mind and his pen, especially in connection with Archbishop Leighton, in his Charge of 1861, delivered at Leighton's own little city of Dunblane—and dealing with the memories of 1661 and 1761.² The first year was that in which Leighton was appointed to the See of Dunblane, the second the beginning of the reign of King George III. and of the Primus-ship of Bishop William Falconar, from which year the persecution of Episcopalians began to abate.

In 1862 he took occasion from another bicentenary, that of St. Bartholomew's Day 1662, when English nonconforming clergy were deprived of their benefices, to impress the same argument on an English audience. This address, entitled 'Reunion of the Church in Great Britain,' was delivered at Kidderminster 22 August, at the request of his

¹ This discourse was published as a separate volume in 1861, with the title, *A United Church of England, Scotland, and Ireland advocated: a Discourse on the Scottish Reformation*. A second edition was published in 1863, with a slightly varying title. It was reprinted, with some curtailment, in vol. i. of his *Public Appeals in behalf of Christian Unity* (No. 5) under the title, *The Scottish Reformation Impartially Examined (Discourse on Tercentenary of Scottish Reformation)*.

² This *Charge*, delivered on 29 August, was never published separately. See, however, *Scottish Eccl. Journal*, p. 124, and *Public Appeals*, i. 281-286.

lifelong and much valued friend, T. L. Claughton, afterwards Bishop of Rochester, and then of the new See of St. Albans. It was very well received, especially in Scotland, and it naturally contains a number of references to the remarkable address of Dr. Bisset, delivered in the spring of 1862, of which some notice has already been taken. He also draws attention to the more amicable attitude of the Free Church as expressed by its Moderator 'the philanthropic Dr. Guthrie.'¹

His Charges of 1863 and 1864 dealt with closely allied subjects, the first 'On Uniformity in Church Government,' in answer to Dr. Caird (afterwards Principal of the University of Glasgow), and the second 'The Principle of Episcopalians a Basis of Unity,' in response to an appeal made by the then Moderator, Dr. Pirie, Principal of Aberdeen—well known as an opponent of Dr. R. Lee's—who invited those who were separated from the Presbyterian Establishment to come forward and state their grounds. A portion of the latter Charge was so highly approved by the then excellent Bishop of Llandaff (Dr. Alfred Ollivant), that it was, at his instance, translated into Welsh and circulated by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.²

This Charge led to some correspondence with Dr. Pirie, but of no very effective character. His speech and that of Dr. Bisset illustrate the lack of continuity in Presbyterianism. A Moderator may make an impression for the moment, but when his year of office is over he falls to his former level.

The most practical effort towards reconciliation made at

¹ This address is reprinted as No. 6 of *Public Appeals*, i. 289-334.

² The *Charges* for 1863 and 1864 were separately published as pamphlets, and also as Nos. 7 and 8 of *Public Appeals*, at the beginning of vol. ii.

this period came, however, from a somewhat different quarter. In the Autumn of 1864 Dr. Rorison, Incumbent of Peterhead—who was mentioned before as the prosecutor of Mr. Cheyne—wrote certain letters to the ‘Scotsman,’ referring amongst other things to the recent improvement of the position of the Episcopal Church by the Duke of Buccleuch’s Act, which led to a correspondence between him and Dr. Lee. Dr. Rorison was himself satisfied that he was the spokesman of a great majority in the Church.¹

‘Nineteen-twentieths of the laity wish Reunion; the southern clergy generally; perhaps half the northern clergy, and (I think) five or six of the Bishops. The *ultra* party are noisy, but not now in the ascendant.’ And he ventured to add ‘Of course I would never pen a line or stir a step in this matter if I did not believe Reunion practicable *without the slightest disrespect to the clergy of the Established Church*. Their full recognition as ordained Presbyters is a *sine quâ non*.’ In consequence of these somewhat bold assertions, preliminaries for a conference of a few leading clergy and laity on both sides were considered; and Lord Rollo (without pledging himself to the details of any scheme) went so far as to offer that the meeting should take place at Duncrub. But the conference was never held. Dr. Rorison had clearly gone beyond what Episcopalians as a body were prepared to offer, and feeling, such as it was, in favour of such a conference among members of the Establishment, became critical and suspicious. It was an occasion lost; but the negotiation cannot have been wholly fruitless.

It was partly, perhaps, on account of this failure that the Bishop of St. Andrews did not continue his series of discourses until after the lapse of another year and then dropped them for a considerable period. His last efforts

¹ See Story’s *Life of Robert Lee*, ii. 126 foll.

at this date were a Synodal address, 11 September, 1866, 'The Ministry of the Church Historically Considered,' which contains matter afterwards worked up and enlarged in his 'Outlines of the Christian Ministry,' published in 1872, and a sermon preached just before the Lambeth Conference and repeated at the re-opening of Chichester Cathedral, after the rebuilding of the spire, 14 November, 1867. Of the Charge of 1866, which contained much interesting historical matter, Major Hugh Scott of Gala, then editor of the 'Scottish Guardian,' writes (26 September) to the Bishop's daughter: 'There is a general agreement it is his most telling Charge. In fact it nearly exhausts the branch of the subject, and I hope he will not be deterred by the obstacles in his way; for, if he cannot accomplish the work under the Providence of God, no one else can.' The sermon entitled 'Euodias and Syntyche: the Scottish Church in its relation to the Church of England'¹ is full of the historical knowledge, and clear and fair statement of historical facts, which I often regret was not used by the Bishop for the composition of a book of larger volume than any that proceeded from his pen. He would have done admirable work as a university professor of Church history, not perhaps from very minute insight into personal character, but from the fairness and accuracy of his exposition, his broad view of the tendency of ecclesiastical movements, and the scholarly treatment of all that he handled.

The sermon in question was, as its title implies, an exhortation to the sister Churches in England and Scotland to be of the same mind in the Lord (Ep. to Philippians, iv. 2). In this sermon he well draws out the great misfortune of the absence of anything like popular consent on the part

¹ It should no doubt be *Euodia and Syntyche*, as it is in the Revised Version of Philippians, iv. 2, as he notices in his reprint in *Public Appeals*, ii. 555 note. The names are both female.

of Scotland to the consecrations of 1610 and 1661 and the association of the Church with arbitrary power, especially in the hands of the Stuarts.

In the same period (1865-6) falls a correspondence with Principal Tulloch of St. Andrews, which was collected by the Bishop, with some remarks of his own, under the title, 'A Plea for Justice to Presbyterian Students of Theology and to the Scotch Episcopal Church.' It took occasion from the admissions of Dr. Tulloch himself with regard to the confession of faith, of Dr. N. Macleod in regard to the observance of the Christian Sabbath, and of Dr. R. Lee in respect to Liturgical worship, to point out that Presbyterian students had also been unfairly treated in regard to the evidence in favour of Episcopacy (p. 35). It deals particularly with the testimonies of Hooker and Leighton and with Tulloch's statement of them and estimate of them in an address to his students. Incidentally the Bishop rather strongly blames Leighton for pusillanimity in retiring from a position where his presence was much needed (p. 13). The correspondence brought out amongst other things Tulloch's willingness to allow Episcopacy to be an Apostolical institution and one of great practical utility. The Bishop replied that it was also as scriptural as infant Baptism, the observance of the Lord's Day, or the doctrine of the Trinity (p. 51). This controversy would seem to have laid the foundation of the friendship which afterwards existed between them. He seems to have met not only Principal Tulloch, but Dr. R. Lee and other leading men of that group when on a visit to Mr. R. Skinner, Incumbent of the Episcopal church at St. Andrews in March 1866.

Side by side with these general efforts in the cause of Reunion, or rather of temperate statement of our position accompanied by a growing insight into the strength of the other side, was an attempt on the Bishop's part to use the

occasions of the changes in educational policy, which were going on in Scotland as well as in England.

A few words on the history of popular education in Scotland may not be out of place, as the main facts ought to be in the minds of all who take a practical interest in the welfare of that country. Scotland, though in earlier days not so forward as England in some of those matters which conduce to social comfort, has been far in advance of the sister kingdom in the matter of elementary and middle-class education, and has long brought her own type of university training within the reach of boys of all classes. The movement began by an Act passed in 1496 in the reign of James IV. Ever since 1567 it has been closely connected with religion. The 'First Book of Discipline' had declared the policy that a school should be planted in every parish and endowed out of the patrimony of the Church.¹ But, though the credit of the policy lies with Presbyterians, the inception of practical efforts in its execution may be largely set down to Archbishop Spottiswoode and the Assembly of 1616 in the reign of James I. of England and VI. of Scotland.² An enabling Act of 1633 gave certain powers to the Bishops to found schools, which were being acted upon by the clergy when the Civil War broke out. In 1646 the first Act was passed to make such schools imperative, but it was unfortunately repealed at the Restoration. In 1696, however, to the great honour of the country, the policy, thus pursued for exactly two centuries under many drawbacks and difficulties, received its crown in the 'Act for Settling of Schools' (Acts of William III. s. vi. c. 26)—an encouragement to those statesmen and social reformers who may be tempted to

¹ See Dr. John Cunningham, *Church History of Scotland*, ii. 198 foll., ed. 2, 1882.

² See W. Stephen, *History of Scottish Church*, ii. 217, 234, &c. 1896.

despair, when the cross currents of politics, time after time, thwart their good desires and obstruct their progress. By this it was enacted that the heritors or landed proprietors should found a school, and provide a house and salary for the master, in every parish. Scotland therefore has had a very long start of England, both in theory and practice, and she has profited accordingly. What an advantage this has been to its strong young men, often of humble parentage and small means, but endowed with aspiring genius or dogged perseverance, is evident when we consider the very large proportion of Scotsmen who have filled positions of trust, both public and private, in every district and in almost every corner of the world-wide British Empire.¹ The long and intimate connection of this education with religion has been also no small factor in the honourable and trustworthy character of these men, even when they have in later days revolted from the narrow limits imposed upon their hearts and consciences by the form in which religious instruction was imparted.

But no one looking at the 'Shorter Catechism,' which is the chief instrument of such instruction in Scotland, from the standpoint of a broader theology, could be satisfied with it or fail to wish to see it altered in some respects. When we ask ourselves why law-abiding and sober-minded Presbyterians in our colonies, such as Canada and New Zealand, are often so impatient of permitting or encouraging religious instruction in our elementary schools, we naturally regard their feeling as in some degree a reaction from the system with which they were familiar at home. In some cases, especially when they belong to the Free Church or other dissenting bodies, they are doubtless affected by

¹ The reader may be glad to be reminded of the effective handling of this topic by Lord Macaulay in his speech on education in 1847. See his *Speeches*, pp. 481-483, Lond. 1854.

the principles of Vinet, and wish absolutely to separate religion from any association with State control—a strange hallucination and practical inconsistency on the part of those who would compel parents to confide the whole formation of character during school-hours to agents of the State without taking any guarantee as to their religious character. In other cases they may be jealous of the activity of clergy and teachers of the Church of England, who are honourably distinguished in many countries for a zeal in education which is not possessed by all ministers of religion. But reaction from the ‘Shorter Catechism’ would seem the most potent influence of the three, and this not only on account of its character but on account of the means used to enforce its being learnt. ‘Is it a fact,’ asked the chairman of the Royal Commission of 1864-5 when examining Dr. R. Lee—‘Is it a fact that the “Shorter Catechism” is taught more by whipping than any other branches of instruction?’ ‘Much more,’ replied Dr. Lee, ‘because it is much more difficult to learn than anything else that man can conceive’ (‘Life,’ ii. p. 93). The mental association of the ‘tawse’ with the first principles of religion is not only not desirable, but is in some cases little short of disastrous.

It was natural, therefore, that the Bishop of St. Andrews should wish to take advantage of the ‘Parochial Schools Act’ of 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. cap. 107) to attempt something in the way of an improvement in religious instruction, especially as it seemed probable that Episcopalian schools would be largely affected by it and perhaps absorbed into the general system.¹ By that Act the hold of the Esta-

¹ As a matter of fact there has been little change in the Diocese. In 1861-2 there were eight day schools belonging to the S. E. Church, with 634 pupils in average attendance. In 1894 there were nine, with 1,309 scholars of the same character.

blished Church on education was somewhat broken down. The masterships of schools were thrown open to teachers of all denominations. But also for the first time the 'Shorter Catechism' was recognised by the law of the land. No teacher, indeed, was obliged to sign a Confession of Faith, but he was required to subscribe a declaration that he would not teach any opinions opposed to the Divine authority of Holy Scripture or to the doctrines contained in the 'Shorter Catechism,' and that he would faithfully conform thereto in his teaching and do nothing to the prejudice or subversion of the Established Church (sec. 12). This seemed to make an opening for at least some broadening of the religious instruction. The Bishop could not help observing that the 'Church Catechism' and the 'Shorter Catechism' covered to a great extent different fields, though they had the great advantage of a common groundwork in the Creed, the Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer, which also occur in both in the same order. He was further not insensible to the strong points of the Scottish Catechism¹ and to some criticisms which may be passed upon our own. He therefore attempted an amalgamation of the two documents, with some slight additions to both, under the title of 'A Common Catechism,' in which he omitted the abstruser parts of the Scottish form, as well as those which might be liable to be misunderstood and misapplied. Such were questions 7, 8, and 20, on 'the Decrees of God,' and 31-35 on 'effectual calling.' A few questions and answers were added to introduce subjects not in either Catechism, such as the three-fold ministry and the use of Confirmation, and the language of both were slightly modified, partly for the sake of style. His object was to combine those portions of the 'Shorter

¹ It was, of course, really English in origin, being the work of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. It was adopted in Scotland, however, as early as 1648.

Catechism' which lift the learner into a high region of thought and feeling—such as the answer which speaks of man as being made 'to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever,' and the explanation of our Lord's three-fold office as prophet, priest, and king—and the fuller and more detailed explanation of the Commandments and the like, with the characteristic excellencies of the Church Catechism. Among minor points suitable to a Catechism, the repetition of the substance of the question in the answer may be named as a merit of the Scottish form.

The extreme difficulty of such an undertaking in itself, and the severe criticism to which it would certainly be exposed on both sides, the probable accusations of unfaithfulness from one party, and of secret designs from another, led the Bishop to abandon its publication in accordance with his brother's advice.¹ He preserved a few copies of it with careful annotations by certain friends to whom he had sent it, the most elaborate being by G. H. Forbes.

But it is worth while to recall that he made the attempt and with a certain measure of success. The Catechism was printed by Thomas Constable, Edinburgh, 1861; but I have only seen his own copies of it, and imagine it must be very scarce, if circulated at all.

In a later year (1864) he was examined before the Royal Commission, then sitting at Edinburgh, on December 5, and besides the evidence he gave, which is printed in the Report of that Commission, pp. 231–240, he tendered to it a 'National Catechism,' which he hoped might lead to a system of combined religious instruction. This was a much less hazardous venture than the 'Common Catechism'

¹ He says in his letter of 12 August, 1861: 'Mainly in deference to your judgment.' He mentions that on that day he had received letters from two brother Bishops deprecating its abandonment.

and simply consisted of so much of the 'Shorter Catechism' as relates to the Creed, the Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer. I am not aware, however, that it excited much attention or exercised much influence.

The time perhaps may come, nay, in my judgment, it has already come, when we ought to take up these earlier tentative efforts in a more practical way. A great change took place in Scotland in 1872, though in some ways not so violent as in England. Elementary education was then removed entirely from the control of the Established Church, the Presbyters of which had hitherto acted as managers, and up to 1861 as examiners (though not, I think, taking much part as teachers), and, generally speaking, had acted to the advantage of the schools. Owing mainly to the jealousy of the Free Church, which was ready to throw up all its schools, school boards were made universal and a board school established in every parish, though voluntary schools were still permitted to receive Government grants. The Act of 1872, however (35 & 36 Vict. cap. 62), was very different in its attitude towards religion from the English Elementary Education Act of 1870. Not only was religious instruction given a prominent place in the preamble, and was thereby made one of the main objects of the Act, but there was no Cowper-Temple clause to limit the use of catechisms or formularies. It was in fact taken for granted that the custom in use would go on. Only emphasis was laid on the conscience clause, and a limitation of the hours of religious instruction and observance was provided, as in England, restricting them to the beginning or ending (or to the beginning and ending) of the school meetings (sec. 68). The 'Shorter Catechism' is still largely taught; but it is growing less common, and means should be devised for supplying its place. There is nothing to prevent an alliance between Presbyterians and Episco-

paliars for this object, except mutual jealousy and mistrust, and possibly the incapacity of our theologians to frame a document suitable for children, and at the same time orthodox and effective as an instrument of teaching, under the limitations to full expression of doctrine which would be felt on either side. Certainly such a common catechism, if it could be framed, would have a great future before it, both in English board schools and in the colonies, where at present, for the most part, religious teaching is of the scantiest and the most ineffective character. I am well aware of the exceptional advantages afforded by the legislature in New South Wales and Tasmania, and more recently in Western Australia; but I know also something of the difficulties of the other colonies, and of the great mischief caused by the antagonism or want of harmony between English Churchmen and Presbyterians. It seems therefore opportune to emphasise the farsighted proposals of the Bishop of St. Andrews, and to suggest to those who read these pages to take up the matter again under perhaps more favourable circumstances.

About this time (1866) the Bishop had the gratification of receiving a remarkable testimony to the success of an earlier educational work of his—the ‘School Greek Grammar’¹—which the Meeting of Head Masters of Public Schools asked him to reduce in length (omitting the syntax), with a view to its being adopted in all their schools. He was thus able to claim the remarkable honour of producing a ‘National Elementary Greek Grammar’ (as my father had prophesied he would do in an article prepared and printed for the ‘Quarterly Review’ in 1840, but withdrawn in deference to Etonian feeling). He was in this way more fortunate in the field of classical learning than in that of theology;

¹ See his letter to Dr. Moberly, then Head Master of Winchester, with this title. Edinb. 1866.

and indeed there can be no question that his small income was most happily and worthily increased by the adoption of this excellent and well-planned book, which still continues in use after an existence of some sixty years. I remember that about the same time my father had the mortification to find his 'Edward the Sixth's Latin Grammar'—which till then had been very successful—superseded by Dr. Kennedy's 'Public School Latin Grammar.' The sale almost suddenly stopped, a result which was I think not by any means in proportion to the relative merit of the two books. I may mention that my uncle's 'Greek Primer,' translated by his second son, was published in January 1871, and that 5,000 copies of it were sold in less than five months.

Another excellent and popular book by the Bishop of St. Andrews had been published a few years earlier, on 'Shakespeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible,' which appeared in April 1864. It was connected in his own mind with the wish to make Shakespeare familiar to young people, and was intended to be a prelude to a 'Shakespeare for the Young,' a project in which his old friend J. D. Walford—the mathematical master beloved by many generations of Wykehamists—was much interested. The following is his own account of it :

I was provoked to undertake the task partly by the want of judgment which Bowdler had shown in his expurgated edition, which goes in great measure upon a mistaken notion that every reference to Holy Scripture must imply irreverence, and partly by the charge of profaneness brought against Shakespeare even by the critics of the highest repute, such as Johnson and such as Gifford—charges which I believed I could show, and I have shown, to be utterly unfounded. The book was very favourably received. From Mr. Halliwell Phillipps (who was acknowledged, I believe, to know more about Shakespeare and everything Shakespearian than any other literary man of his time, and with whom I had no further acquaintance than that I had met him once for a few moments in the street at Stratford during the

tercentenary celebration of 18[64]) I had the satisfaction of receiving a letter, dated 13 December, 1864, in which he wrote of it as 'a book which is, to my thinking, the most able and important volume ever printed about Shakespeare.'

The book was published by Messrs. Smith, Elder, and Co., who paid him fifty pounds for it; and it shortly went into a second edition. But for some unexplained reason, though every copy of both editions was sold, the publishers (in 1871) estimated that they had lost over one hundred pounds upon it. It reached a third edition in 1880,¹ and a fourth edition in 1892, and will, I imagine, keep a permanent place in our literature.

The reader of this book cannot fail to grasp a very important lesson—namely, that much of the charm of Shakespeare is due to his wonderful familiarity with Holy Writ and to his *natural* use of its language, without cant, slang, conventionality, or profaneness—such as too often disfigures the pages of some, even of eminent writers, who use Scripture freely. And through this familiarity lighter English literature has gained a dignity both of style and matter which has never entirely left it. When we think of Montaigne and Rabelais we realise the blessing of Shakespeare.

Another Shakespearian publication was his admirable Tercentenary Sermon at Stratford-on-Avon (Sunday, 24 April, 1864), 'Man's excellency a cause of praise and thankfulness to God.' In it he draws inspiration from the judgment of John Keble in his 'Oxford Lectures on Poetry,' one of the few books in modern Latin that have an abiding place in our literature of this century. He points out Shakespeare's consistency, especially in his religious tone

¹ In the third edition he added a considerable appendix of additional illustrations, together with his Stratford Tercentenary Sermon, and a valuable index compiled by Miss M. Barter.

and his perpetual reference to a high standard of virtue, his consistency as the poet of the English nation and of home life, his sympathy with classical literature as opposed to mechanical and physical philosophy, marking his mind as a kind of antithesis to that of his contemporary, Francis Bacon. He points out also his claims to our regard in virtue of his personal character, his meekness, modesty, and gentleness. I wish that this sermon could be prefixed to one of the many cheap editions of Shakespeare now issuing from the press. It would be a great help to young students as indicating to them what sort of beauties to notice, instead of, or in addition to, those more or less important philological and critical points to which lecturers too often alone direct their attention.

The 'Shakespeare for the Young' was never completed, but three volumes, containing twelve of the 'Historical Plays,' were published by Messrs. Blackwood in 1883, with useful marginal explanations, introductions, and longer notes. Had the whole been completed, and then each play published cheaply in parts, the book might have met with the success it deserved, and have been largely used for reading in clubs or by the fireside, and for examinations. As it is, I fear it is too little known, chiefly, perhaps, because the plays most often desired for reading aloud were left unedited.

The same period (1866) saw the beginning of a new plan for the City of Perth, in which the Bishop and his family took a deep and continuing interest—the foundation of St. Andrews School Chapel near the great railway station. Since 1859 he had worshipped with, and ministered to, a solid and well-to-do community in St. John's Church; but he now began to feel that more might be done for the poor, and that the spirit of Congregationalism and the system of pew-rents was injuring the religious life of the

Church. The scheme was put forward in a sermon before the congregation of St. John's, 'The claims of the poorer brethren in assemblies for Christian worship'—based naturally on the teaching of St. James. He appealed for funds to build a church to be called St. Andrews, intending to add schools and a schoolmaster's house to it. The school-chapel was all that was then built, and it was opened 23 August, 1868. An infants' school was added later. The Bishop practically became its incumbent, being assisted by the Rev. James Christie, who was ordained by him a month before as his curate. It is pleasant to note the name of Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, as a subscriber of ten guineas to this new church, and to find the Bishop of St. Andrews confirming for him at Dundee in April 1868. The Bishop's correspondence contains many notes from the Bishop of Brechin, asking for his services as a preacher, or for help in regard to an inscription and the like.

The following letter, which belongs to this period, shows the Bishop's thorough knowledge of Anglican theology. It refers to a portion of Jeremy Taylor's famous work of which I must candidly confess my previous ignorance. It is dated 3 August, 1866.

In answer to an unknown correspondent who writes to me from Dublin describing himself 'a *doubter*,' but as he trusts 'a humble and candid' one, I would simply recommend a small portion of Bishop Jeremy Taylor's '*Ductor Dubitantium*,' which contains 'a moral demonstration, proving that the religion of Jesus Christ is from God' (see Book I., chap. iv., rule 2; Vol. xii. 39–66, Heber's edition), and of which the pious Bishop Horne declared that 'no tract ever came from the pen of man better calculated to dispel those *doubts* and difficulties which may arise in the mind of a believer, or to *work conviction* in that of an unbeliever who can bring himself to give it a fair and attentive perusal.' And the reason why I give this advice is, because it is not with us as it was with those to whom, as eye-

witnesses of them, the evidence of miracles—and in many instances the evidence of miracles *alone*—was first offered, and, to some of them at least, proved sufficient. But *our* case is that of persons to whom God presents a combination, or rather an accumulation of evidences—all of which are to be taken in, as it were, at once by the mind's eye, if we are to do justice to the Divine Goodness and to the responsibility of our own position.

I have pleasure in complying with the request of my correspondent, and I pray God to bless the advice which I have offered.

Another letter in the same month (21 August, 1866), and addressed to Major Scott, of Gala, is also of interest of another kind :

Pecuniarily I can do little to promote the cause of 'Keble College,' but all I can do (as I trust, honestly) I do most cheerfully and thankfully by enclosing a cheque for 3*l.*

My copy of the 'Christian Year' was a gift, in 1829, from my dear father—one of the first to recognise in the book the merits which are now universally acknowledged—as may be seen from a letter of his in the memoirs of that good layman, Joshua Watson (vol. i. p. 311): 'He is full of beauties and goodness. I have given a copy to each of my three boys.'

I also possess a copy of the first edition, 1827.

You refer to the attitude assumed by Mr. Keble, on a painful occasion, towards our Church, as a matter to be regretted but also to be forgiven and, as far as may be, forgotten. I agree with you entirely; and I rejoice to think that several communications which I had with him subsequently were all of a nature to render that desirable course more easy and natural. Among the rest he was so good as to send me 'from the author' a copy of his 'Life of Bishop Wilson,' the last work which he published. And it is a circumstance *not a little remarkable* that on the very *last* page of that work he had occasion to print in an 'Erratum' certain words of Bishop Wilson's 'Sacra Privata' which had been omitted in their proper place, and which, while they are irreconcilable with the teaching of 'Eucharistical Adoration,' are strictly in accordance with that recommended and prescribed by our Episcopal Synod.

The years 1866-7 were marked in several ways by a growing intercourse between the Church of England and the Scottish Episcopal Church, which were of considerable importance to the latter, and not without influence on the development of the larger body—helping it to throw off something of its often unconscious Erastianism. The laying of the first stone of Inverness Cathedral by the Archbishop of Canterbury was an event which, at the moment, excited no little comment. The annual Episcopal Synod was held in that pleasant northern city on 16 October, 1866, and on the next day Archbishop Longley, who had been tutor to Bishop Eden (as well as to Bishop Wordsworth), laid the stone in the presence of all the Scottish Bishops and of the Bishop of North Carolina, U.S.A. (Bishop Thomas Atkinson). Bishop Wordsworth chronicles this as ‘a distinction won so deservedly by the character which the esteemed Primus of our Church has borne through the whole course of his life.’¹ A remarkable feature of this gathering was the sympathy of Inverness Presbyterians, many of whom contributed to the building fund.² Nevertheless it stirred up no little controversy, in which the newspapers took part. The London ‘Times,’ for instance, wrote strongly in condemnation of the Archbishop’s action. Fortunately the ‘Scotsman’ took a more impartial view. The Bishop of St. Andrews preserved the memory of this incident in a Latin quatrain, which may be inserted here :³

Jupiter e coelo fulsit tonitruoque sinistro
 Anglus, et inde sequens nil nisi fumus erat.
 Dextrorsum at Scotus respondit Jupiter, et mox
 Inde sequens toto lux erat alma polo :

¹ See *The Lambeth Conference—a Synodal Address*, 7 November, 1867, p. 1. ² See Archibald’s *Historic Episcopate*, &c., p. 349.

³ See *Public Appeals*, &c. ii. 530. The reader will again notice the spelling *coelum* (as if from *κοῖλος*), which my father and uncle generally

which I may give in English :

Heaven lightened on the left : in thunder spoke
The English Jupiter : then all was smoke.
But on the right the Scottish Jove replied,
And genial light was spread on every side.

Another happy event to the Bishop of St. Andrews, and to the Church at large, was the consecration of his most intimate friend, Thomas Legh Claughton, Vicar of Kidderminster, to the See of Rochester. He was naturally invited to be one of the consecrators, probably the first time for more than two centuries that an Archbishop of Canterbury had accepted such aid from a Scottish prelate. At the same time he received authority from the Bishop of Oxford to confirm in two places in his Diocese—for my father at his benefice of Stanford-in-the-Vale, Berks, where he confirmed forty candidates, and at St. Peter's College, Radley, between Abingdon and Oxford, where he confirmed eighteen. At Rochester he was the guest of Archdeacon Grant, well known for his stirring and instructive Bampton Lectures on 'Missions,' who was afterwards, to my great advantage, a near neighbour of my own when I was Canon there (1883). Claughton was consecrated in his own Cathedral by Archbishop Longley on 11 June, 1867, and Bishop Wordsworth was naturally interested on such an occasion to trace out links of connection between Rochester and Scotland, and his own Diocese in particular. One there is which must strike every visitor to the Cathedral who inquires into its history. The Early English choir, which has been added to the rather solemn Norman nave—the most ancient of any Cathedral in England—was erected with the proceeds of offerings at the shrine of St.

adopted, although scholars now agree that *caelum*, &c. is the more correct form. My uncle adopted it in his later years. See p. 21.

William, the good baker of Perth, who gave every tenth loaf to the poor. His title to saintship was sealed, or perhaps rather created, by his murder on a pilgrimage to Canterbury in the year 1201—an opportune event for the monks of Rochester, who thus became possessed of a wonder-working shrine.¹ The remains of his tomb are preserved in the north-east corner of the northern transept. Later associations² attach to Bishop Richard Neale, one of the consecrators of Spottiswoode in 1610, and to Bishop John Warner, who, in 1667, founded scholarships at Balliol College, Oxford, for the support of the Episcopal cause in Scotland. A yet closer friend to that communion was good Bishop Horsley, who, in 1792 (while still Bishop of St. David's), had first succeeded in repealing the oppressive penal laws, which, amongst other things, forbade clergy in Scottish orders from ministering to more than five persons in the same room.

But there was a still more important business outside Scotland in which the Bishop of St. Andrews took part in this period, viz. the first Lambeth Conference of the Anglican Episcopate, held in 1867³—a great venture which was much criticised at the time, but which has been abundantly justified by its results.

The first suggestion of such a meeting came from the Canadian Church in February 1866. After the proposal

¹ My uncle preserved an interesting letter from Precentor Venables, of Lincoln, on this subject (26 November, 1867), in which he describes how the miracles worked at this tomb proved a convenient instrument for assisting the monks of Rochester in their rivalry with other religious foundations. St. William was formally canonised in 1256.

² See *The Lambeth Conference—a Synodal Address*, Edinb. 1867, pp. 1 foll. and 17.

³ See *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*, by his son, R. G. Wilberforce, iii. 229 foll. (Lond. 1882), *Life of A. C. Tait*, *Archbishop of Canterbury*, by R. T. Davidson and W. Benham, i. 574 foll. (Lond. 1891), and *The Lambeth Conferences*, S. P. C. K., ed. R. T. Davidson (now Bishop of Winchester), and Bishop Wordsworth's *Synodal Address*.

had been under consideration for about a year it was determined by Archbishop Longley that the experiment should be tried, and invitations were issued by him, dated 22 February, 1867, and addressed to all the Bishops of our communion, who then numbered one hundred and forty-four. Of these, rather more than half (seventy-six) met in the Guard-room of Lambeth Palace—where the Conference of 1897 also met—for a four days' private discussion, of which, however, a report crept surreptitiously into the 'Guardian'—from 24 to 27 September inclusive.

The chief figures at this gathering from the Colonial Church were Bishop Gray of Capetown, and Bishop G. A. Selwyn of New Zealand—men, both of them, in a way, of heroic character; and of the home Church, Samuel Wilberforce (then of Oxford); A. C. Tait of London, and Connop Thirlwall of St. Davids. The chief subject of debate was, naturally, the case of Bishop Colenso of Natal, who had been deposed by Bishop Gray in a sentence signed December 1863, but who was in various ways upheld by the Civil Courts to which he had appealed. This matter had been excluded from the agenda paper; but it was found that so many Bishops had come together in the hope of discussing it, that it could not be kept back from consideration. While no one defended Colenso's opinions and proceedings, there was a good deal of feeling among members of the home Episcopate of the danger of independent and, perhaps, overbearing action on the part of the representatives of some of the Colonial Churches. This feeling led to a division between men like Gray and Selwyn, to whom Wilberforce generally lent his aid, on one side, and Tait and Thirlwall on the other. The former were champions of colonial independence, and thought that the Mother Church had much to learn from the colonies; the latter were in favour of the principle of Establishment and desired to do nothing to provoke a

conflict with the State. Objection was taken to the constitution of the South African Court, and to the method of trial; and it was felt that a court of first instance, especially if some of its members had previously expressed themselves strongly on the subject afterwards brought before them judicially, could hardly deliver a judgment from which there was no appeal. We have seen this difficulty in the Forbes case; it was even more acute in that of Colenso.

In regard to the principle of Establishment, Wordsworth was at one with Tait, and, as the latter remarks,¹ endorsed what he said. He further acknowledged certain imperfections in Bishop Gray's procedure, but he thought them almost inevitable under the difficult circumstances. He did not, unfortunately, make any minute notes as to his part in the Conference, but it is evident from Bishop Gray's 'Life,' and from letters addressed to him later by Archbishop Longley and Bishop Tozer, that he had taken rather a prominent part in amending and drafting various resolutions, particularly 'the paper signed by the great majority of Bishops about the Natal difficulty,' as Bishop Tozer describes it (13 February, 1868). This must have been the following, signed by fifty-five Bishops: 'We, the undersigned Bishops declare our acceptance of the sentence pronounced upon Dr. Colenso by the Metropolitan of South Africa, with his suffragans, as being spiritually a valid sentence' ('Gray's Life,' ii. 350). His opinion on the subject generally will be found more at length in the next chapter.

Among the by-events connected with this Conference was a series of sermons by Bishops in St. Laurence's, Gresham Street, in the week preceding it. It was here that Bishop Wordsworth first delivered his sermon on 'Euodias and Syntyche,' already referred to. Being

¹ *Life of A. C. Tait*, i. 380.

suddenly called to supply the place of the Primus on another interesting occasion—the reopening of Chichester Cathedral (14 November)—he repeated the same sermon, for which he received the warm thanks of Dean Hook. He wrote the same night :

Ten thousand thanks for your glorious, manly—permit me to say—*English* sermon. I send you my sermon on the consecration of Bishop Luscombe. I wrote to the Primus, Bishop Gleig, to know how I was to describe the Bishops—he would not hear of their being named from their Sees. Bishop Sandford told me that until his new chapel was built he never ventured to wear a surplice—when he first went to Scotland his chapel would have been pulled about his ears. Bishop Jolly told [me] that when he was preaching as a young man some soldiers were seen approaching the village, and all his congregation fled, leaving him in the pulpit alone in his glory.

In the previous month of October Bishop Wordsworth had also taken part in the Wolverhampton Church Congress, so that he was now well known and appreciated in England. Dean Stanley, a few years later, wrote of the Chichester sermon (after remarking that Oxford divines used to speak of the Church of England as Judah, and the Church of Scotland as Samaria) : ‘ The most accomplished scholar, the most purely Oxford theologian among the Scottish Bishops, has in these latter days spoken with a far truer and nobler sense of the mutual relations of the two Churches, and entreated them to be at one with another on the equal terms of “ Euodias and Syntyche.” ’¹

These incidents, which were refreshing to himself and helpful to the Episcopal Church, were not, however, without their bearing upon the Reunion movement in Scotland. The Presbyterians of Inverness were, unhappily, not a type of the general feeling towards Archbishops and Cathedrals ;

¹ *The Church of Scotland*, p. 176, ed. 2, 1879.

and the Moderator of the General Assembly (Dr. Crawford) delivered a rather unfriendly and disheartening address, in which he committed himself to the strange position that our Lord did not intend that the Church should have an outward and organic unity. Various other causes combined to check the movement, political as well as ecclesiastical; and checked it certainly was. It was not till after an interval of fifteen years (1867-82) that the Bishop of St. Andrews took it up again with something of his old zeal. Indeed, it can hardly be expected that movements of this kind should go on at all, except in waves or steps—and steps of slight elevation followed by long intervals of level ground, sometimes sloping downwards. But, if Christian love has lifted us ever so little, the downward slope will not descend quite to the old level. The Episcopal Church was now more closely allied with the Church of England, and this was resented by Presbyterians. Yet this alliance was necessary to the Episcopal Church in order to give it greater breadth and knowledge, and a greater feeling of confidence. An interval was therefore needed for such growth—and for similar parallel growth in the Presbyterian Establishment—after which it became possible to take up the question once more.

The year 1867, in which the Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church took their places side by side with their English brethren, therefore marked an epoch in history, which cannot be overlooked, and may fitly serve as a term to our survey of public events in this period. The same year saw another important movement in the Presbyterian Church taking shape, viz. the foundation of the 'Church Service Society.' From this year, then, there were new beginnings in both these bodies which had necessarily to develop—and still have to develop internally—before they could, or can, draw much nearer to one another. To put

it plainly, it was necessary that the Episcopal Church should move more with the times and become a body more worthy of national confidence and of proved ability to lead, and that the Presbyterian should become more Catholic in its usages, habits, and feelings. It will take a long time to produce the necessary changes ; yet something was done by the subject of this memoir, as we shall record in a later chapter.

But before concluding this chapter, some details of a more personal nature must be mentioned belonging to this time.

The domestic events which touched the Bishop most deeply were doubtless the deaths of his old friend and colleague, Warden Barter, which took place on 8 February, 1861, and that of his then youngest son,¹ Kenneth, a bright and beautiful boy, who died the next year at Glenalmond, where he had only just been sent (16 May, 1862).

He was the youngest boy in the school, and entered eagerly into the games. At the annual school sports he overheated himself in a race and took a cold which attacked his throat, and proved fatal in a few days. His grave is under the east window of the College Chapel. The occasion of his death is referred to in the concluding lines of his much-sorrowing father's epitaph, which we may render :

Sport, boys : but sporting know Death lies in wait.
To search for serious thoughts may be too late.

The whole inscription, of which this is a part, is as follows :

H(ic) s(itun) e(st) | quod mortale habuit | Kenneth Andreas
Wordsworth | [puer ix annorum et ii dierum] | vix prius ad

¹ Another son was born to him a few years later (1866), and then a daughter (1868), the thirteenth and youngest of the family.

scholam missus | quam ad domum, uti spes est, | cœlestem
 avocatus; | Quatuor filiorum nasci ultimus, | Primus decessisse; |
 Parentum nuper deliciae | nunc, si Deus misereatur, | pro brevi
 tempore | desiderium. | Natus Maiæ xiv, 1853. Obit Maiæ
 xvi, 1862. ||

Lude, puer, si vis; memor at tu lude propinquæ
 Mortis: post mortem seria sera nimis.

The death of Warden Barter was an event in which I also had a very real concern, as it occurred a few months before I left Winchester School, where his house was (through his affection for my uncle) always open to me. He was to us boys a sort of hero, and a worthy one, especially to those of us (and they were not a few) who were constantly entertained by him on 'leave-out days.' Even in his old age he was a man of noble presence and most attractive genial aspect. He was known to us as having given his name to a glorious forward drive at cricket, as an untiring walker, and a man of unflinching courage, and a thorough Christian without cant or pretence. He knew how to talk charmingly to boys without any appearance of being bored or making conversation, yet without losing dignity. No wonder that every one loved him.

The following admirable sketch was written by the Bishop of St. Andrews for Mr. Adams's 'Wykehamica,'¹ but only a sentence or two was printed by the latter from it. The reader will be glad to have more of it.

In asking me to contribute to your volume upon Winchester a few sentences about Warden Barter, you are so good as to say that no one could speak of him with more weight than myself. It is very true, so far as intimacy goes; to which he admitted me so unreservedly, that I looked upon him almost as a second father, or elder brother. But the consciousness of this weight

¹ Published in 1878; see note to p. 324. The book contains some other interesting matter, both on the Warden and his brother.

presses me down, just in proportion to my knowledge of him and my attachment to you. It is indeed a constant reflection with me, now that I have passed my threescore years and ten, that to have known him—and one other friend not unlike him in many points of character—the late Bishop Hamilton of Salisbury—so intimately as I did, has been among the greatest blessings of my life—blessings for which I must give account. If ever there was a man in whom there was not a grain of selfishness it was Robert Speckott Barter. And to this perfect absence of all consideration for self was added in equal perfection the finest, nicest discernment and regard for the feelings and circumstances of others; so that the difficult Christian precept to ‘honour all men’ from the beggar to the prince, seemed to come to him as part of his natural disposition. And what is perhaps a still rarer gift, he had the happiness of being able to give expression to this discernment if called upon to do so on any public occasion, either of business or festivity, with an ease and felicity of speech such as the greatest orator might have envied, but could not have surpassed. Intellectually, it must be confessed he never did himself justice. He lacked the ambition to excel others which so often gives the spur which is necessary to overcome constitutional indolence; and while he had no inclination for self-display, the natural talent which he possessed enabled him to meet the calls made for the exercise of his literary powers either in the pulpit or elsewhere with only too great facility. In short, it may be said with truth that he had within him all materials for making not only one of the best (for that he was), but also one of the most distinguished men of the time in which he lived: while his personal appearance, his noble form and features, the amiable disposition shining out so clearly through the sweet expression of his countenance, would have contributed to render him an object of universal admiration on a much wider sphere, had he made it any object of his life to be so admired.

Among the athletic exercises in which he excelled in early life, he became eventually most famous as a tennis player. Indeed, during his latter Oxford days he had the reputation of being one of the best gentleman players in England. It was this which first led to my acquaintance with him. . . . Soon after Mr. Barter, having been elected Warden of Winchester, left Oxford to settle in his new office, 1832, and both the Master-

ships of the College fell vacant. . . . As I was myself a Harrow man, and as there had been, I believe, no instance since the foundation of the College of the appointment [of second Master] having been bestowed upon any but a Wykehamist, it is not probable that I should have ventured to come forward, and still less that I should have been elected, if my tennis acquaintance with the Warden had not tended to smoothen the ground and induced him to regard my candidature not only without prejudice, but (I believe I may say) with some prepossession in my favour.

He then goes on to describe the Warden's sympathy with, and genial encouragement of, every effort for the good of the boys, instancing especially the experiment made by Mr. Hullah of teaching them all to sing—as the College boys, at any rate, were bound by the Statutes to profess themselves able to do before their election.

In this happy sketch the Bishop connects Warden Barter's name with that of another kind friend and admirable man—my honoured and much-loved predecessor, Walter Kerr Hamilton, whose premature death in 1869 was a cause of wide-spread sorrow. Of the two he wrote at the close of his life:—

Walter Hamilton and Warden Barter.—The two men whom I have known in the course of my long life most full of the milk of human kindness—most free from any taint of selfishness—most ready to prefer others to themselves, were Walter Hamilton [and Robert Speckott Barter].¹

Of the generosity of Bishop Hamilton he has left the following delightful account, which I venture to think is most creditable to both parties concerned.² It belongs, I believe, to the year 1864³ and, if so, to 28 or 29 May.

¹ *MS. Note-book*, iii. 36.

² *MS. Note-book*, iv. 45, 46.

³ I find a letter from Bishop Hamilton asking 'where I may pay to your account 200*l.*' It is dated 20 December, and is filed among the letters of 1866.

I have now to record—and I do it with the deepest gratitude to the Giver of all good and to His noble-hearted instrument—an instance of sympathy and generosity in a friend such as I suppose that few in this uncertain life have had the happiness to experience. I was staying with Walter Hamilton, the Bishop at Salisbury, and we were walking together one day in the Palace garden, when quite unexpectedly he said to me: ‘I have been thinking over your circumstances in Scotland, and I am sure with your small income and so large a family you must find it difficult to get on, so I propose to raise for you a sum of 200*l.* a year from among your friends in England, which I can do with perfect ease.’ The proposal took me quite by surprise. I had never given him reason to suppose that I was in pecuniary difficulties, and now, though I admitted I might sometimes be rather straitened, I assured him such was not the case. I thanked him for his great kindness; but I urged that my independence as a Bishop might be compromised by such assistance, and therefore I could not accept it. He was not, however, to be diverted from his purpose. He promised that I should never know from whence the money came, and that I need be under no apprehension of the least curtailment of my freedom in any quarter. I did not give my consent, and the matter was left apparently undecided. Nevertheless the money came, came regularly year by year through a banker’s hands—never less, sometimes considerably more, than 200*l.*, till Hamilton’s death (1869), and after his death, at his request the subsidy was carried on by Claughton [Bishop of Rochester], and only ceased when I was elected Fellow of Winchester [May 1871]. My income was largely increased through that appointment. When it is considered how many and various are the claims which an English Bishop has upon his time, his thoughts and sympathies, I think it will be felt that such an example of genuine disinterested beneficence and simple goodness of heart ought not to be allowed to pass unrecorded. Up to this day I have never learned who my other benefactors were, with the single exception of Lord Robartes, because he left an order under his will that his donation should be continued till my death (see ‘Annals of Early Life,’ p. 96).

Some other incidental notices of Bishop Hamilton which

appear in my uncle's correspondence are worth mentioning. My father writes to his brother (February 1867): 'Thank you very much indeed for your kind words of encouragement on the notes to Joshua. English Bishops, alas! have no leisure to obey St. Paul's precept to give attendance to *reading*; and I cannot expect any such cheering language from *them*. One exception there is—your excellent friend and brother of Sarum.' Bishop Hamilton himself writes most characteristically (23 May, 1867): 'I know not when I have shed so many tears of joy as I did on hearing that dear Claughton was called to the Episcopate.'

CHAPTER VI

LAST YEARS AT PERTH. 1868-1876

‘Through evil report, and through good report.’

Proposal to consecrate Bishop Macrorie in Scotland—Proposal to revive Archiepiscopal titles—Irish disestablishment—Bishop Claughton—Biography in ‘Scotichronicon’—Important Conference of Clergy and Laity at Perth, 1868—Laymen in Synods—Letter to Roundell Palmer on the principle of Establishment and his reply—Christopher Wordsworth made Bishop of Lincoln (1868-9)—Hamilton’s death (1869)—Depressing period—Troubles among the Bishops—Renewed troubles at St. Ninian’s—Mr. Burton Provost (1871-1885)—Perth Nunnery—Ritual—Charge of 1872—Letter from Bishop Williams of Connecticut—Precentor Humble’s presentment: dismissed by the Bishops—Special Synod of 1873—Proposed Committee—Address by Dean and other clergy—Various circulars—The Bishop’s intended resignation (1874)—Resignation suspended—Attempts at a *modus vivendi* with Provost Burton—Its partial success (1874-5)—Precentor Humble’s death (February 1876)—Bishop moves to St. Andrews (October 1876).

Deaths of Bishops Ewing (1873) and Forbes (1875)—Of Rev. W. G. Shaw, of Forfar (1874)—Sermons &c. in England, especially in English Cathedrals—Visit to Gladstone (1876)—Work of New Testament Revision (1870-1881)—*Final Considerations*—Dr. Field—Dean Blakesley—Secondary advantages of the Revision—Charge of 1881—Letter of Archdeacon Palmer—The writer’s judgment—Removal of Divinity Students from Glenalmond and consecration of Cumberae Cathedral (1876).

Important book on ‘Outlines of Christiau Ministry’ (1872)—Its value—Supplemented by ‘Remarks on Dr. Lightfoot’s Essay’ (1879)—Letter from Bishop Williams—Note on ‘Sacerdotalism.’

ONE issue of the Lambeth Conference of 1867 was to draw attention to the Episcopal Church in Scotland as a body which might fulfil an important function for the benefit of the Colonial Church, as it had done in the preceding century for that of the United States. During the month of January 1868 negotiations were in progress between the Bishop of Capetown and the Scottish Bishops, with the

cognisance of Archbishop Longley, in which Bishop Hamilton also had a share, with a view to the use of a church in Scotland for the consecration of a Bishop for the Diocese of Natal. Legal difficulties were interposed in England, otherwise Bishop Wilberforce would have permitted the use of a church in his Diocese, and Mr. Burgon would have been glad if it could have taken place at St. Mary's, Oxford. A majority of the Scottish Bishops were quite inclined to lend a church for the purpose, and passed a resolution to that effect at a conference held at the Bishop of St. Andrews' house, Wednesday, 29 January, the Primus and the Bishops of Brechin (Forbes), St. Andrews, Aberdeen (Suther), and the Coadjutor of Edinburgh (Morrell) being present. At the same time they were strongly and unanimously of opinion that it would be most desirable that the consecration should rather take place in the Province of South Africa. The minutes (which are in the hand of the Primus) further state that the Bishop of Argyll protested against the proposal to take action in the matter, and the Bishop of Glasgow was decidedly opposed to it. It was a relief to them when, on the last day of January, the Primus announced that Bishop Gray had withdrawn his request. The following letter, addressed to Dean Ramsay, who in this matter was the mouthpiece of Bishop Tait and Dean Stanley, puts my uncle's own position in a very clear light. It is dated 12 February, 1868 :

I return the letters with which you favoured me, having read them with much interest.

You are quite right in supposing that I never in my heart desired a Consecration in Scotland. I was also, and still am, scarcely less opposed to a Consecration in England. In the discussion at the Lambeth Conference, and afterwards privately to the Bishop of Capetown at the Wolverhampton Congress, I ventured to offer my strong opinion that, having the moral weight which he already possessed, any further *clinging to*

England would be a mistake, and would only tend to injure his own cause. Claiming to be a Provincial Church (now free from State control) they must act as such (as we in Scotland do), and *take the responsibility of their action to themselves*. I saw several objections (some connected with the election of a new Bishop) which could only be solved, as I thought, by action in the Province, and partly also in Natal itself. In short, I feared that, by pressing for more than he had already got, *out of the Province*, he would at once increase his difficulties, and put himself and his Province into a false position. And all this so far, I am afraid, has come to pass.

On the other hand, with regard to our own action, my opinions—if you care to know them—have been these :

1. I consider Dr. Colenso to have been canonically deposed, and the two links which Mr. Dodd speaks of *worth nothing* ‘in foro Ecclesiæ.’

2. When the matter first came to us (and before I knew the Archbishop’s opinion) I strongly recommended caution to the Primus, because

(1) We Bishops are not the Church.

(2) I think the Bishop of C[ape] T[own] a little impulsive.

3. When it seemed necessary to form a practical judgment, having ascertained how some Churchmen of weight in this Diocese felt about the matter, I saw no sufficient grounds upon which I could take to myself the responsibility of refusing, still less of urging upon others the refusal of compliance with the Bishop of C[ape] Town’s request, backed as it was with the virtual approbation of the Archbishop of Canterbury. That responsibility in the sight of God was, I think, a very awful one.

The Bishop of C[ape] Town (not, indeed, without the imperfections incident to humanity under such difficult and unparalleled circumstances) has acted most nobly the part of a Confessor for God’s Truth against one whom five years ago (February 1863) the English and Irish Archbishops and Bishops, as one man, pronounced unfit for his sacred office by suggesting to him to resign it. Since then substantial justice—all the justice that case admitted of for the maintenance of the Truth—has been done upon the offender. How he is yet to be dealt with, or how the place which he has forfeited in the sight of God and man is to be supplied—being still impenitent and

contumacious—is a matter which, for various reasons, as Mr. Dodd justly observes, requires the deepest and most far-sighted prudence on the part of the Church Authorities of the Province itself, subject (so far as they are subject) to the Archbishop of Canterbury, but to no other person, power, prince or potentate upon earth. In such a case I may venture to give private advice (as an Anglican Bishop), asked or unasked—but I cannot do more; I cannot *refuse* assistance, which I may give (in my opinion) not uncanonically, not unlawfully, when applied to by those who are alone responsible, who ought to be able to judge best, and who consider (rightly or wrongly) the assistance asked for necessary or advisable *pro bono Ecclesie*.

Dean Ramsay acknowledged this letter as ‘most satisfactory.’

The Bishop was concerned with two other public matters in the spring of 1868, viz. the question as to a revival of Archiepiscopal titles in Scotland, raised in connection with the Roman Catholic movement towards the establishment of a titular hierarchy, and the disestablishment of the Irish Church. The first of these questions did not, I think, come before the public; but, from the letters which the Bishop has preserved, it seems probable that more would have been heard of it if either the Primus had been Bishop of St. Andrews or the Bishop of St. Andrews had been Primus. But even had it been so, the practical difficulties at that time were so great that it is unlikely that the movement recently taken by the Canadian Church, and followed in 1897 by the Cape, West Indies, and Australia, would have been anticipated nearly thirty years before in Scotland. It was no fault of Bishop Eden’s, however, that it was not done, for he writes on 11 July :

Do you see that the Romanists have got the start of us by making Dr. Errington Archbishop of Glasgow? The sooner you are Archbishop of St. Andrews the better. We must sound the Church at once as to the revival of Metropolitan Jurisdiction.

As to the Irish Church, the Bishop was asked by the Primus to draft and promote a petition, to be headed by the Scottish Bishops, in opposition to Mr. Gladstone's Bill; and he went some way towards doing so. He tried, however, in vain to bring in prominent men of the different Presbyterian bodies, and did not even succeed eventually in gaining a clear vote of the Scottish Bishops for it—the two 'Alexanders,' for different reasons, and Bishop Wilson, of Glasgow, being opposed to it. A form of petition, couched in the names of the Bishops alone, was, however, circulated in print. A copy lies before me which was evidently sent to Bishop Hamilton. It has no signatures attached, and bears evident traces of its authorship. It states that, '*at present* the entire realm of Great Britain and Ireland is consecrated by the national profession of the Christian religion.' . . . 'At present the forms of Christianity professed by the State throughout these kingdoms recognise no foreign or extra-national jurisdiction. This we believe to be in strict accordance with the doctrine of Revelation, and, at the same time, a necessary safeguard of our national liberties.' The proposed legislation would give increased ascendancy in Ireland to Rome. It would weaken the testimony given by the Legislature against Roman error. Mention was made further of the weakness arising from the establishment of a different form of Protestantism in Scotland. Sympathy was also expressed with Roman Catholic political disabilities. Finally, the petition refers to the sufferings of the Episcopal Church from disestablishment in Scotland, and draws a conclusion unfavourable to the prospects of such a measure in its effect on the sister Church of Ireland.

The following is a specimen of Bishop Claughton's hasty, amusing, and very intimate notes (24 April, 1868). It refers to the debate in the House of Lords on the Irish Church:

My dearest Andrew,—If you had heard Lord Derby speak last night you would have exclaimed ‘There’s Life in the old Dog yet’ (you remember the Picture at the Manchester Exhibition bearing that title—an old Shepherd’s Dog found at the bottom of a rock nearly dead; next to which there was a Picture of Lear in his last moments. An old Lady with a Catalogue in her hand applied that title to King Lear).

Abiit Renn Dickson Heref. Succedet Edwardus Inf. Dom. Convoc. Prolocutor. Ita dicit T. L. Roff.¹ Dear old Sarum revivificatus est. How you must be elated and yet depressed by the fulfilment of your vaticinations *περι Γλαδστονίου!*

When do you come to Danbury?

I think there is a reaction beginning about the Irish Church. The Bishop of London’s [Tait’s] words were well received in the House of Lords last night. He spoke so well. Brother Samuel not so well. Now, my dear Andrew, you never write to me.

I do so wish I were a good speaker. There is such an infidel coterie just opposite me in the H. of Lords. . . . We had a delightful day at Maplestead. Old Barter of Sarsden was so genial.²

In May of the same year the Bishop was forced, by Dr. Gordon’s insisting upon publishing Lives of living Bishops in his ‘Scotichronicon,’ to direct two friends in revising or re-writing his own. It was this, perhaps, that first gave him the idea of writing his Autobiography. (See above, p. 108 *n.*)

The ordinary Synod of this year was held in May, at Lord Rollo’s hospitable house, Duncrub; but it was much surpassed in importance by a conference of clergy and

¹ ‘Renn Dickson [Hampden], Bishop of Hereford, is gone. Edward [Bickersteth], Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation, will succeed him. So thinks T. L. [Claughton] of Rochester.’ Hampden’s successor was, however, Bishop Atlay. Bishop Hamilton was taken ill the Wednesday before Easter (8 April, 1868), but rallied enough to take his ordinations and to confirm in the autumn in Dorset. After a painful illness in London, he returned home 29 July, and died at Salisbury 1 August, 1869.

² Mr. Charles Barter died a short time after, 24 June.

laity held later in the year at Perth. The school chapel (St. Andrews) was opened on 23 August, and in it, a month later, was held this conference (24 September), which was intended to be annual, after the fashion of our Diocesan conferences now familiar in England. I have already quoted from the Bishop's interesting opening address, which gave a sketch of the history of the Diocese, in Chap. II. I will add here some particulars of the condition of the Diocese at this time, which will serve to mark the steady growth that had taken place during his Episcopate.

Of the thirty-seven churches and chapels of all kinds now in the Diocese, all except two (Blairatholl and Kirriemuir) have been built, or otherwise acquired, since the beginning of the present century. Or if the view be confined to the period of my own Episcopate, which began when the first half of the century had expired—viz. in 1853—of these thirty-seven churches and chapels, twenty-one have been built or otherwise added since that time; that is within the last fifteen years. In these fifteen years new churches (to place them in chronological order) have been erected at Meikle, Bridge of Allan, Callander, Alyth, Pitlochry, Birnam, Kinloch-Rannoch, Crieff, Cupar-Fife, and lastly at St. Andrews. Mission Chapels have been opened at Weem (where a new church is now in course of erection), at Leven, Dollar, Doune, Dunning, Elie, Croiscraig, Perth; besides the private chapels open to neighbours, poor as well as rich, so far as they can afford accommodation, at Duncrub Park, Dupplin Castle, and Glamis Castle. Of course this increase of congregations implies a similar increase of clergy; the seventeen clergy of fifteen years ago being now twenty-nine. And, I am thankful to add, the increase in the provision for their permanent accommodation is still more remarkable. In 1853 there were only two parsonages in the Diocese—viz. at Dunblane and Kirriemuir. Since then, in addition to those two, there have been built, or otherwise acquired, fifteen, so that there are now seventeen.

He mentions further that in the school chapel, where they were assembled, 100 scholars had been gathered in a month.

Besides encouraging details, he had, however, to note that thirty years before there had been larger congregations at Blairatholl, Strath-Tay, and Tummel Bridge; and that extinct congregations, noticed in the last century, at Auchterarder, Balgowan, Kinclaven, Glamis, Cortachy, Memus, &c., ought to be revived. Indeed, the Episcopal Church ought to be represented in every one of the 159 parishes of the united Diocese. He spoke in something like despair of the failure of his attempts to co-operate with Presbyterians, referring specially to the promise taken by ministers at their ordination to do nothing to subvert Presbyterian government and discipline. But he hoped the truth would in time make its way.

The subjects discussed were Church progress in town and country districts, and good speeches were made both by leading clergy and laity; but no resolutions were passed. The Conference was considered to have been very satisfactory. The Primus writes about 'the marvellous success of your first Conference. I was glad to see Methven [i.e. Mr. Smythe, a leading layman and great friend of the Bishop's] was there, and should much have liked to have watched his countenance.' Bishop Forbes writes: 'I never have had the opportunity of expressing to you my admiration of your able address at the Conference, which seems to have been on the whole a great success.' The results of this Conference were seen in a resolution of the Episcopal Synod held next year at Edinburgh (16 and 17 November, 1869), when the question of the powers and functions of laymen in Synods was remitted to the consideration of Special Diocesan Synods, to be held before Whitsunside 1870, and the resolutions to the following effect were agreed to by the Bishops: (1) that in future notices of the annual Synods should be read in church two Sundays previous to the Synod; (2) that all Lay Communicants should be

invited to attend ; (3) that such laymen should have free leave to speak. The subject, and others connected with it, was discussed at the Special Synod of 1870, but no definite action was taken. It was reopened at the Episcopal Synod of 1873, but without any immediate result. Finally, in 1876, the General Synod established the Representative Church Council, which dealt with matters of finance and external administration, a point beyond which the Episcopal Church has not yet gone. Those who are interested in the question, as many now are in England, will find useful material in Bishop Wordsworth's 'Charge' of 1870, and its Postscript in reply to arguments. He dwells much upon the proper qualification of Laymen to be admitted—they must not only be confirmed and be communicants, but accept the canons and make some form of subscription. He would not *elect* the lay members, but have their names as Synodsmen put in by the clergy. This is to apply to Diocesan Synods. As regards General Synods, laymen are to be chosen from Diocesan Synodsmen, and be fully thirty years of age, and be *obliged* to attend. The safeguards he contemplated were : voting by orders if demanded ; a right of veto in each order ; and a power in any of the three orders to claim reconsideration of a resolution by another General Synod. He considered that such General Synods should meet *triennially*, and their functions not be confined to legislation only. He would not, however, abolish the Episcopal Synods.

In November 1868 interesting letters passed between the Bishop and his old friend, Roundell Palmer, on the latter's candidature for Parliament and his 'Richmond Address.' The Bishop, in his zeal for the principle of Establishment (notwithstanding difficulties which he felt as to applying it to the case of Ireland), went so far as to say that his friend had neglected the teaching of revelation

on the subject. His language was startling, as he afterwards felt himself :

‘ The notion that the ruled are to be judges of what is right and best for them in matters of Religion, and that Rulers are to accept *their judgment* and *not God’s*, appears to me an unscriptural, an infidel, notion—excluding God from the government of His own world ; or at least supposing Him to prefer such mere human *justice* (so to call it) to the maintenance of His own Truth,’ &c.

The letter is of course that of an intimate friend, speaking his mind, and must not be judged as in any way harsh or rough. The reply acknowledges its kindness, and is written in a very open and affectionate style. ‘ I shall say to you some things which at the present time I could not be induced to say to (almost) any one else, and which I have not said to any one else in fact.’ The writer comments on the strength of the Bishop’s language as calculated to search his own conscience, especially as coming from one ‘ who though of an *impetuous* natural temperament is not usually rhetorical or unreal in his way of handling great subjects.’ The substance of the reply is practically that he differed from the Bishop on the question of the *revelation* of the duty of Establishment. I will quote a few sentences which exhibit the noble character of the author—a character afterwards proved in action, as all his contemporaries knew.

When I gave my reasons for not holding the opinion that a political Establishment of Religion was always required by the duty of a Christian State, I said (in effect if not in words) that *the best way of promoting or advancing the interests of religion* appeared to me to be not at all times and in all places one and the same ; but to be liable to variation, according to circumstances : and that State Establishments of Religion, when most certainly right, had not been created upon any abstract or prior theory of the duty, in that respect, of a Christian State, but had arisen spontaneously, as the natural fruit of the religious

anxieties of the people. By 'the interests of religion' I certainly meant the interests of Truth, and the advancement of the Knowledge and Service of the God of Truth. Had I believed that this cause (to which, by God's grace, I desire to devote my whole life, and for which my mind is wholly made up to renounce everything else which I believe, or even suspect, to have a tendency to tempt me to be unfaithful to it) would be endangered or compromised by one course, rather than another, of those which I was called upon to consider, I should, without hesitation, have stated this as a reason for rejecting that course.

After discussing Scottish and Irish Establishment the letter concludes as follows:—

My doctrine is, that every act of a Christian man, public or private, political or individual, should be done with a view to the promotion of God's glory, and should be consistent with faith in His revealed Truth: but (if I may, without irreverence, allude to words not Christian) that in the government of nations there are *πολλὰ μορφαί*—not of Truth, but of the means of serving the GOD of Truth.

Ever yours affectionately,

R. PALMER.

A few days later my father, then Canon of Westminster, received a note from Mr. Disraeli (dated 13 November, 1868), in which he expressed his intention, if it met my father's views, of recommending the Queen to raise him to the Episcopal Bench. No See was named, and it was doubtful what was meant. He was first desirous to decline, but it was rumoured that it was Ely, which attracted him from its relation to Cambridge. On the day he received the letter he went down to Wellington College, where he was the guest of Dr. Benson (afterwards Archbishop); and consideration in company with that kind friend led him to accept what he then supposed would be, as it turned out to be, nomination to the See of Lincoln.

The Bishop of St. Andrews was naturally called to assist

in the consecration, which took place on St. Matthias' Day (24 February, 1869), at Westminster. Immediately after it he went down with his wife, who was in very poor health, to Seaton, in South Devon, where he remained nearly two months, and then paid his brother a visit at his new home, Riseholme, a few miles from Lincoln. The Bishop from time to time felt his isolation in Scotland very deeply, and his friends at this period were anxious to find him some Cathedral preferment in England; but nothing came of their applications. There was also some talk of his going to Edinburgh, on the vacancy of the place of coadjutor—Bishop Terrot still living on, a wreck of his former self, till 2 April, 1872. The expenses of a large family pressed heavily upon him, and it was not till May 1871 that he had the relief of a Fellowship at Winchester College. Bishop Hamilton's death on 1 August, 1869, was also a great sorrow. The next few years were, in fact, years of considerable depression and disappointment, chiefly connected with the renewed disturbances in the Chapter of St. Ninian's, which were at their height in 1872–3. But there was also considerable discomfort in the College of Bishops. One question concerned the propriety of Bishops and others preaching in Presbyterian Chapels. Certain English dignitaries did this, and sides were taken in consequence. Then Bishop Ewing accepted an invitation to preach in the University Church at Glasgow, and Bishop Wilson interfered to prevent him—a dispute in which Bishop Wordsworth openly took the part of Ewing. Then there was considerable heart-searching (in 1871) as to Bishop Ewing's theology—which in its way was as broad as the Bishop of Brechin's was high. The latter had published his book on the Articles in 1867, and it reached a second edition in 1871. His further publication of a service containing prayers for the departed, in a way

which seemed to implicate his brother Bishops, gave renewed alarm, though no public action followed.

But the St. Ninian's disputes were so near home that they were a perpetual source of distress. I will not enter much into detail about them, but something must be said as to the principal events.

The fact of Provost Fortescue's resignation in July 1871 has been already referred to (Chapter III. p. 48). The Provostship was then offered to Mr. Shute, Incumbent of Callander, who, as the Bishop had reason to suppose, was likely to be acceptable to the congregation. He declined, apparently because of the insecurity of the endowment. At length (October) the Bishop determined to offer the place to Mr. Burton, who had been in the Diocese upwards of twenty years at Blairgowrie, Alyth, and Meikle.

He possessed many recommendations. He had the qualities of a Christian gentleman and a competent scholar. He had long experience of the Diocese, and hitherto he had shown no tendency to extreme doctrines or extreme practices; and I hoped that he would work with me. But in this I was disappointed. He had been brought into the Diocese originally by Mr. Forbes, of Medwyn, and he had not strength—nor, perhaps, inclination—to resist the closer and sturdier influence of Mr. Humble, who knew Lord Glasgow's mind, and *this*, for serious reasons, must remain paramount. The consequence was there followed no permanent improvement in my relations with St. Ninian's. I made once more the attempt to attend the services, but I soon discovered that they were still not conducted in a manner for which I could make myself responsible (which, the Cathedral being regarded as the Bishop's Church, my attendance would seem to imply) without serious damage to my general influence throughout the Diocese.

We have already described (in Chapter IV.) the main circumstances of the earlier conflict. They were to a certain extent repeated in this period. As in 1859, so in 1872, the Bishop's Charge at the ordinary Synod was a

detailed censure of the proceedings at St. Ninian's. The special subject then was the Collegiate School; now it was the 'Perth Nunnery,' an institution not definitely connected with the Cathedral, but supported by the same interests. There was also the question of ritual, on which Mr. Burton had accepted a pledge that it was to be 'in conformity with' or 'not in excess of' that usual in English cathedrals. The Bishop took pains to inquire what English usage was, and found that it was exceeded by that of St. Ninian's in some more or less important respects. In particular, he found fault with the Eastward Position *throughout* the Communion service, and the use of the chasuble. It was not as if the Cathedral had laid hold on the public mind through its services. On the contrary, the Bishop had good reason to think that it had not been a success during the time of his withdrawal from it. Mr. Burton informed him that when he came into office the average congregation on Sunday morning was under twenty. The Bishop, knowing his own powers as a preacher and a teacher, could not doubt that if he were practically Incumbent, and the Provost and Precentor his curates, he could have made the Cathedral a power in the city. But the statutes, while defining the Provost's position to be 'under the Bishop,' were so drawn as to make the Provost and the Precentor acting together almost as independent of him as the Dean and Canons of an English Cathedral. The Bishop's disappointment found vent in his Charge, delivered at the Ordinary Synod 26 September, 1872, in which he reviewed the various painful circumstances of his relation to the Cathedral, sometimes mentioning names, but more often not doing so, and in general terms displaying his suspicion of the loyalty of the Cathedral party. It was on this Charge that Bishop Williams, of Connecticut, wrote (5 December, 1872) :

It is a real comfort, in these days, to read such words as it contains. We have all had, I suppose, our share of trouble from these men, who have, as I told one of them the other day, 'taken up everything in Romanism except its principle of obedience, and abandoned everything in Protestantism except its self-will.' I am particularly gratified to find that you have taken up the same ground on which I have all along placed myself, i.e. that you will not move judicially till a formal and proper presentation is made. It is very easy for Presbyters and Laity to say that the Bishop ought to move, and so to shift off upon his shoulders responsibilities which fairly belong to them. I have held, and shall continue to hold, just that very position, and I rejoice to find it endorsed by an opinion which I rate as highly as I do yours. The great trouble with these people is their awful insincerity. . . .

Men were hard hitters in those days!

All those passages in the Charge that touched persons named or unnamed were swept together by Mr. Humble, and represented as an indictment of himself; and the Bishop was thereupon presented to the Episcopal Synod as having publicly censured a clergyman subject to his Episcopal jurisdiction 'without previous trial or consultation with the members of the Synod in terms of Canon No. 44, and without his having any opportunity of being heard in his own defence,' and accused 'of perversion of justice and of oppression of the said Rev. Henry Humble, and also of violating the provisions of the said 44th Canon above mentioned, and also of behaviour unbecoming the character and office of a Bishop.' This presentment was signed by Mr. Humble, Lord Charles Lennox Kerr, and Rev. Hardwicke Shute, 'late of Callander, now of 28 Notting Hill Square, London,' and the articles were served upon the Bishop 30 January, 1873.

The presentment was heard by the Episcopal Synod, and the charge unanimously dismissed on 27 March. At

a special meeting of the Chapter on 17 April it was attempted to give effect to the words ‘under the Bishop’ as meaning that ‘all the ministrations of Divine service shall be subject to the Bishop’s approval and control,’ but the motion was lost by three to five. A Special Synod was then held on 8 May, in which the history of the Cathedral was recounted at some length by the Bishop, and special stress was laid (*inter alia*) on the custom which had grown up of celebrating with only one Communicant, and the consequent exaltation of the sacrificial element in the Lord’s Supper so as to obscure the Communion element. There was some controversy as to whether the Bishop had at one time sanctioned this practice, which was apparently permissible in Scotland in cases of necessity, such as had frequently occurred in the past history of the Church. He felt convinced that he had not sanctioned it; but, if he had, he fell back upon the result of his bitter experience, which had taught him ‘to distrust where he had formerly placed confidence,’ and ‘slowly and even reluctantly to dislike some practices which formerly he had deemed innocent.’ This Charge contains near the end a forcible passage on the work which the Cathedral ought to do and might do, and it is remarkable as containing no reference to the presentment out of which he had come victorious. The Bishop subsequently offered to endeavour to treat St. Ninian’s as the Cathedral if he were allowed a *veto* on the arrangements of the Church and the future order of the ritual, but this was declined. The Synod wound up by a resolution for the appointment of a committee to confer with the Chapter as to the nature of the necessary amendments in its constitution. But, after some hesitation, the Bishop declined (on 12 May, 1873) to have anything to do with the appointment of such a committee, and there was apparently no other constitutional way in which the Synod

could give effect to its resolution. He was bitterly disappointed, and for the time abandoned St. Ninian's (as he wrote in 1885) 'in despair,' determining to treat it as any other 'ritualistic church' to which he might have duties as Diocesan, but which he could not be expected to do more than tolerate. He felt that he must decline responsibility for its management and the conduct of its services.

The majority, however, of the clergy were not willing that the Cathedral should sink to such a position, and about the beginning of the next year¹ the Dean of the Diocese and about eighteen others addressed him on the subject, asking him either to resume his place at St. Ninian's or to sanction the action of the Cathedral Chapter, apart from its Bishop, *ad interim* till the holding of the next General Synod. To this he replied, in a circular dated 12 January, 1874, declining either course, and at the same time speaking of himself as 'being pained and injured . . . by breaches of faith in more than one quarter.' Provost Burton replied to this, in a circular sent to the Dean and all the clergy, showing considerable irritation, dated 28 January. The Bishop replied, in another circular to 'Mr. Burton' (he did not call him 'Provost'), dated 29 January, also sent to all the clergy, in which he justifies in detail the charge of breach of faith. Mr. Johnston, of Kirkcaldy, and Mr. Tuttiett, of St. Andrews, also printed circulars in defence of the Bishop. Mr. Burton naturally replied in two other circulars, one addressed to the Dean and one to the Bishop, and so the matter in dispute became unhappily only too notorious.

¹ The address is undated, but the Bishop docketed it as received 12 January. It had been drawn up some weeks previously, and neither by the Dean (Forry) nor by the Provost and resident Canons. I do not, in fact, know by whom it was composed.

It is not surprising that the Bishop should have thought this an opportunity for seeking to discharge himself of a troublesome post, and in the month of April he wrote to my father enclosing the draft of a letter announcing his resignation to take place at Whitsuntide. My father accepted the resolution as having been well weighed, adding, 'You have a right to a discharge.' Others, however, like Bishop Claughton and Archdeacon Grant, feared that it might be precipitate. The former ends his letter :

L. sends you her best love, and is in amazement what is to become of Mrs. Wordsworth, and at the loss of the Feu. So am I. It was the most delightful house in Scotland. I hope you have not been too precipitate.

The letter was, however, issued, dated 15 April, and addressed to the Dean. It refers to his wish to live and work in England, where he had a *locus standi* as Fellow of Winchester College. He mentions the eclipse of his hopes in regard to closer relations with the 'Established Church,' the most material cause of which was the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland. With regard to the Diocese, though progress had been made, there was 'at the heart . . . a cause of anxiety, of difficulty, and trouble, which no other Diocese of our Church has experienced in the same degree.' He refers to the sympathy which had been shown him in his stand against ultra-ritualism and Romanising practices, which sympathy, however, had been recently much neutralised (of course by the Address of the Dean and eighteen clergy and what had followed it). He touches on other influences with which he had to contend. Leighton's retirement is naturally cited as a precedent, and the letter ends by thanks to his brethren in the Episcopate and to the great body of clergy and laity of the Diocese. It was clearly intended to be a farewell.

Many remonstrances, however, followed and, further, it was difficult to find a fitting successor to take such an office. The income was only 500*l.* a year even now; and, much as he desired to retire, he could not with equanimity think of being succeeded by one who might take a party line in opposition to his own.

He spent most of the next month in England, in London (for the Revision of the New Testament), at Salisbury (where he was actually thinking of taking a house in the Close), Winchester (on College business), and Kidderminster (where his eldest son Charles was now curate). On his return to Scotland he issued a short note addressed to the Dean (dated 26 May), saying that he had received so many urgent solicitations praying him to reconsider his intention, that he felt it his duty to postpone his resignation for the present. The matter seems gradually to have dropped.

The very day on which he came to this decision he determined—and I venture to think he could hardly have done otherwise—to reopen negotiations with the Provost for a better understanding at St. Ninian's, the details of which negotiations were prolonged till the end of the year. But peace was so far secured at once that he preached in the church rather frequently in the month of June and later. The Provost, who was naturally desirous of peace, was ready to accept a compromise when the Bishop was present, i.e. at the midday service. The chief points were that the vestments were to be given up, and the Eastward Position not taken except at the consecration prayers and the prayer 'for the whole state of Christ's Church,' which follows them in the Scottish Office. In making this latter concession the Bishop was clearly moved by my father's 'Plea for Toleration by Law in certain Ritual Matters,' added to a pamphlet called 'Senates and Synods: in

reference to the Public Worship Regulation Bill' which then agitated the Church of England, which pamphlet was published in June 1874.¹ The Bishop of St. Andrews wrote a good deal at this time and later in reference to the Position of the celebrant, especially in letters to Mr. Beresford Hope and to the 'Times,' which he republished in 1876 with an essay under the title, 'Three Conclusive Proofs that the use of the Eastward Position is contrary to the mind and intention of our reformed Church,' dedicated to his friend Claughton. His explanation of the words 'before the Table' was that they referred to the ordering of the bread and wine, and that the Priest was expected to return to the 'north side' after he had so ordered them. The 'north side' he understood to refer to the long side of a table placed east and west along the gangway of the church. Like all similar writings of his, this tract contains much information. It is still worth reading, though since the Lambeth judgment of 1890 the matter is on a different footing. The Bishop's views on that judgment are given in the Appendix. He was, however, in 1874, prepared to accept the E.P. in others under certain circumstances and to a certain extent.

Unfortunately Precentor Humble did not lend his aid to a peaceful compromise. And the Bishop, on his part, thought it his duty to call attention by circular to the Precentor's paper on 'Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament' in Mr. Orby Shipley's volume of 'Studies in Modern Problems'—a paper containing much that was open to criticism, and extremely disrespectful to the Scottish Bishops generally, and to his own in particular. Canon Humble did not reply in detail, but protested that the Chapter, to whom the circular was addressed, was not the proper tribunal to sit in judgment upon him.

Notwithstanding this interruption the Bishop continued

¹ See, also, his *Miscellanies*, ii. 135 foll.

to officiate at St. Ninian's and printed a sermon 'preached in the Cathedral' on 1 January, 1875, called 'Spiritual Edification in reference to the Public Worship of God'—a short and simple discourse in which he laid down two good principles adopted from a 'distinguished layman'—probably Beresford Hope—as to any changes in public worship :

1. That the change should be in its own nature favourable to a devout and *intelligent* adoration of God in the sanctuary.

2. That it should not limit, but *increase*, the active participation of the flock in the service.

Finally he urged that all should unite in making the subordination of the external element of worship to the spiritual a mark of the Cathedral services.

For some time he continued to preach in St. Ninian's when he was at home, and his family returned to worship there ; but, though certain practices were altered, the tone and temper of the worship was distasteful to him, and the reconciliation did not really last till the close of his residence at Perth and removal to St. Andrews in the autumn of 1876. The chief actor in the dispute was, however, himself removed by another cause. Canon Humble, who had long been in failing health, was persuaded to go for a six months' holiday to the south of France, and he died at San Remo at the early age of 57 on Monday, 7 February,¹ 1876.

On his deathbed he desired a clergyman who was with him to express regret to the Bishop for any 'harsh or unfitting words' he might have used in the heat of those controversies in which he had felt it his duty to engage with him. He was buried at San Remo. My uncle calls him,

¹ Some accounts say Sunday, 6 February, but he survived to the Monday morning. I have before me a note in Provost Burton's hand: 'Copy of telegram received this morning from San Remo—"Canon Humble died six o'clock 7 February."' This was stated more at length by the Provost in his funeral sermon.

like Mr. Mackonochie, a man of adamantine mould in regard to what he considered to be right; but his range of vision was a narrow one. He had good abilities, and was well informed on a certain class of Ecclesiastical subjects. Faithful and kind, especially to the poor, in the discharge of pastoral duty, his chief interest lay in the maintenance of ritual, which not only prevented progress, but went far to empty the church in which he ministered.

It was not, therefore, without a feeling of relief from painful associations and responsibilities unsatisfied, that the Bishop's thoughts turned towards the opportunity for making himself another home in the ancient City of St. Andrews itself. The landlord of the Feu House refused to renew his lease except on terms that he thought unreasonable, and he determined, not without some regret, to leave the centre of his Diocese for the circumference. He left Perth 26 October, 1876, and entered upon his large new house 'The Hall' (called by him 'Bishop's Hall' or 'Bishopshall'), formerly a boarding-house for students at the University (of which my friend Mr. Andrew Lang was once an inmate), on 20 November. This move was a turning point in his life, and naturally opens another chapter of his biography. He was seventy years of age, but he had sixteen years of vigorous life and work before him, an episcopate, that is to say, as long as that of my father, or any of my three immediate predecessors in the See of Salisbury.

It will be convenient, however, before we close this chapter, to record some of the more prominent events of the period affecting the Bishop's position.

Bishop Ewing, of Argyll, died on Ascension Day 1873, and Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, 8 October, 1875. The former was succeeded by Rev. G. R. Mackarness, brother of the Bishop of Oxford, the latter by Bishop Jermyn, of Colombo, the present Primus. Both the deceased Bishops

were considerably younger than himself, and both were friends as well as neighbours, Bishop Ewing especially so, as his many frank and affectionate letters testify. But perhaps the most important loss sustained by the Bishop of St. Andrews was that of his old pupil, and attached supporter and fellow-worker, the Rev. W. G. Shaw, who had been for twenty years Incumbent of Forfar, which took place 25 October, 1874. I do not find any letters in his correspondence which are more thoroughly sympathetic than those of Mr. Shaw. He was apparently a man quite after the Bishop's own heart, unaffectedly simple, generous, and conscientious, and worthy of the fullest confidence.¹

Of the Bishop's public work for the Church in Scotland generally, the most important was a long speech in the Episcopal Synod of 1875, which led to the meeting of the General Synod in 1876.² His object was to urge that the General Synod should (1) give canonical recognition to the Scottish Cathedrals; (2) restore Trinity College, Glenalmond, to its original status, and (3) provide for the meeting of the General Synod at fixed intervals. With the first and third of these objects I should imagine that few of those who wish well to the Episcopal Church can fail to sympathise, nor can the second be a subject of much difference of opinion as far as the duty of supporting the school, as the principal school for Churchmen in Scotland, is concerned. The retention or removal of the Divinity students is a question of a different character, as in most cases it would seem to be the teaching of experience that young men of university age and schoolboys cannot prudently and effectively be educated within the walls of the same college. But the Bishop was very keen for Glenalmond as originally planned and as successfully worked

¹ See the *Funeral Sermon* preached at Forfar, All Saints' Day 1874, *The Gospel a Defence against Evil Tidings*. ² See *Public Appeals*, ii. 595.

by himself, not realising, perhaps, how few Wardens were capable of the combination which he had achieved. The removal of the students to Edinburgh took place in 1875 on account first of a fire at Glenalmond. He desired their return, but there they remained, and there they are now conveniently located close to St. Mary's Cathedral. Of this matter he wrote at the end of his life as follows :

The removal being now a *fait accompli*, and accomplished, I hope, with every prospect of success, I have no wish to revive the controversy concerning it. Only I think it due to the founders of the College to place on record the opinion which I held, and still hold, in opposition to my Episcopal brethren and others. I have no doubt the main promoters sincerely believed the change would be for the advantage of the students ; neither can I doubt that other motives were allowed to give the conviction an undue bias. It was an important object to the Bishop of Edinburgh [then Bishop Cotterill] to supply the want of endowment for his Cathedral. To be able to place the Pantonian Professor and Bell Lecturer upon his staff would be a material help in that direction. But this, of course, must involve the withdrawal of so much strength and support from the Staff of the College. The Professor himself would naturally feel the attraction of Edinburgh society as a decided gain in comparison with the solitude of Glenalmond.

His wish for legislation in the General Synod about Cathedrals was not only due to his desire to see St. Ninian's put on a better footing, but was concerned with the movement for making the little College Chapel on the island of Cumbrae into a 'Cathedral of the Isles,' and developing the College in a manner which he imagined might be injurious to the divinity training at Glenalmond. He naturally regretted the diversion of money and interest towards what he could not but regard as rather a fanciful project, but any rivalry of a serious kind never existed. The consecration, however, of the Chapel as a Cathedral took place on Wednesday, 3 May, 1876.

Unfortunately nothing was done at the General Synod of much importance except the establishment of the 'Representative Church Council.'

Of other public work in which he was engaged outside Scotland in the period embraced in this chapter, I may mention his assisting at the first consecration of a 'suffragan' Bishop in our own times, that of Mackenzie Sub-dean of Lincoln, who was made Bishop of Nottingham, 2 February, 1870. This was one of the occasions when Archbishop Alexander Lycurgus, of Syra and Tenos, who was then my father's guest, attended a solemn function of our church. The Bishop of St. Andrews also preached frequently in English Cathedrals, as at Norwich and Peterborough in 1870, Rochester and Salisbury (1872), Durham (1873), Norwich (1875), and Chester (1876). On the latter occasion he visited Mr. Gladstone at Hawarden, an incident of which he gives the following account in a letter to Miss M. Barter, written (29 August, 1876), just before he left the Feu House.

You have heard, I dare say, of my visit to Mr. Gladstone; a busy, restless-minded man, if ever there was one. I looked upon him with a sort of melancholy interest, and all the more, when, through the vista of the past, I remember Lincoln (Newcastle), Canning, Herbert, Bruce (Elgin), Hope (Hope-Scott), Hamilton (your dear Bishop), Twisleton—all more or less my juniors, like himself, and *all gone!* and Manning and W. Palmer *gone also*, in another sense. We talked over Glenalmond, of course, and, after sundry other topics, came at last to *Homer*; and he kindly gave me, at parting, two of his Homeric articles which have appeared in the 'Contemporary.'

He preached again at Salisbury the Sunday (5 November, 1876) after the reopening of our choir—the other preachers at the festival being Bishop Moberly, Bishop Woodford of Ely, and Bishop Mackarness of Oxford. In his sermon, 'The Worship of God to be maintained

under all Circumstances,' he paid, as might be expected, a warm and affectionate tribute to Bishop Hamilton, in whose memory the restoration was carried out.¹ His sermon at the Norwich Choral Association meeting in 1875 was also printed, and contains some interesting material. It was published at the expense of the Committee. He quotes in it an anecdote related by Bishop Horne of two Portuguese noblemen attending the anniversary of the National Schools in St. Paul's (when 6,000 children sang together), who exclaimed, 'This is life indeed; we have never lived until now.' In printing he added a remarkable and beautiful passage from the heathen philosopher Epictetus, on songs of gratitude due to the Deity, by those who can sing them, which I have never seen quoted elsewhere. His historical knowledge was shown in a sermon on a similar occasion at St. Albans (preached some years earlier, 27 July, 1871), entitled 'Preservation of St. Albans Abbey a National Duty.'

But the most important external occupation of these years was the Bishop's share in the Revision of the New Testament, on which Committee he was elected, on the proposal of Bishop Moberly, of Salisbury, 5 July, 1870. He attended 109 times out of a total of 407—as many as could be expected considering the distance which he had to travel. Although the New Testament was not published till 1881 it may be convenient to treat the subject here rather than in a later chapter. The journeys to England, the visits to friends, the association with other learned men, were secondary results, which to a man of his temperament and circumstances were extremely valuable. Of the primary results it is not easy to speak. He did not, indeed, find himself in harmony with the methods and

¹ The subject of the sermon is Daniel's continuance in prayer (vi. 10); see below, p. 279.

actions of the majority of his colleagues, and his elaborate 'Final Suggestions on New Testament Revision: the Four Gospels,' printed in 1879, disclose the fact that he considered many of the alterations unnecessary and pedantic, especially those made in regard to the use of the definite article and the tenses of verbs.¹ He feared rightly that the revisers ran the risk of preventing the popular acceptance of their work by the amount of changes they introduced, and this particularly because the first part of that work was the Gospels, in which needless alteration would be most generally felt and most keenly resented. He agreed, in fact, with Dr. Frederick Field, whose 'Otium Norvicense, Pars Tertia,' was probably the most important criticism of the many to which the Revised Version was subjected. Unfortunately both the 'Considerations' and Field's 'Otium Norvicense' were only privately printed, though as many as 1,000 copies of the latter were struck off.²

The following paragraphs were prepared for the 'Annals.' I have had to fill them out here and there.

One of our New Testament company [Dr. Roberts] has written to me quite recently [(September 1881): 'Since I wrote my "Companion," my judgment as to the Revised Version has become much more unfavourable. Indeed I cannot but look upon it, in its present state, as being a deplorable failure.'] I do

¹ These suggestions were intended for the use of his colleagues, and were made under a resolution which forbade the re-opening of the most serious questions: they are, therefore, not a complete representation of his opinions.

² In a letter to my uncle, Dr. Field says (20 December, 1881): 'I printed 1,000 copies, and have up to this time distributed nearly half that number to such persons, dignitaries (as Bishops, Deans, and a few others), libraries (of colleges, schools, &c.), and private scholars, as I thought most likely to be interested in the subject. I have received many letters of thanks, and I find a general *consensus* of opinion in regard to the revision, expressed in very similar terms to those which you have pronounced in your Charge and myself in my prefatory remarks.'

not quite go so far as that, but [I was seriously dissatisfied with the result].

Our Chairman had many excellent qualities for his post,¹ but he was much to blame for not reminding us that by introducing so many minute and unexpected alterations we were exceeding the terms of our commission,² and not only for not reminding us of the fact, but for not preventing it, as I think he might and ought to have done. It was not enough that he felt (as doubtless he did) that he was only carrying out what appeared to be the wishes of the majority of the Company. [But he had a duty to those who felt as I did :] *Non hæc in foedera veni.*

I joined the Company on the understanding [that our instructions would be exactly followed]. And when I found, at the completion of the Gospels, that we had far exceeded those instructions I was anxious to withdraw; but Dr. Scrivener persuaded me to remain on to the end. He himself shared my dissatisfaction, at least to some extent; and he assured me that when the end came I should have an opportunity of joining with others against the proceedings of which we disapproved; but this was never done. No such opportunity was ever found.

He goes on to remark on the occasional jests which some members of the company allowed themselves, observing, however, that the Nonconformist members of the body always set an example of gravity, and then proceeds:

This suggests to me the remark that the Revision gave occasion to other important results besides those immediately connected with the work itself. The perfect level upon which we met, and the brotherly cordiality which prevailed throughout our meetings, rendered it impossible that the barrier which had previously existed to social equality between Conformists and

¹ Out of 407 meetings Bishop Ellicott attended 405, and Dr. Troutbeck, the secretary, 406. Dr. Scrivener came near them with 399 attendances.

² Reference is made to resolutions passed 25 May, 1870, viz.:—1. 'To introduce as few alterations as possible into the Text of the Authorised Version consistently with faithfulness.' 2. 'To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the Authorised and other English Versions.' These resolutions reproduce the sense of the Report accepted by the Convocation of Canterbury in 1870.

Nonconformists, at least to some extent, should any longer be maintained. And for my own part I rejoiced in this. I looked upon it as a step taken, not only towards bringing about more intimate relations, but, if it please God, ultimate reconciliation.

The attitude of Dean Blakesley, of Lincoln, was similar, but not quite so critical. He writes (9 January, 1881) :

I hardly know whether to rejoice or grieve at the termination of our task of Revision. It is certainly an improvement on the old Version ; but then it might have been made much better still if executed by fewer hands. I certainly think it has proved useful in allowing common occupation to Churchmen and Dissenters : (some of whom) were so mild and so diligent and accurate, that one felt tempted to say, 'Talis cum sis, utinam noster esses.' Moulton, the Methodist professor, struck me as being one of the most valuable members of the whole Company.

The 'Final Considerations' were never published ; but in his Charge for 1881 the Bishop took occasion to discuss the subject of Revision in a manner which must have influenced those who were present. It was in one sense a misfortune that this valuable paper was not published in a more permanent form, but only in the newspapers, such as the 'Scotsman,' the 'Glasgow Herald,' and the 'Glasgow News' (all of Friday, 23 September).

On the other hand, the Bishop seems to have felt that in making his protest public he had done as much as his conscience required him to do ; while he might have seemed to be disloyal to his colleagues¹ if he had circulated it with all the advantages of a well-printed pamphlet, which would go down to posterity as an indictment of their immense and self-denying labours.²

¹ See *Public Appeals*, ii. 597. He reprinted a small part of the Charge there—that dealing with the nomenclature of the orders of the Christian ministry.

² Mr. John Henry Parker, of Oxford, actually offered to publish it for him gratis, to be sold for a penny.

Edwin Palmer, then Archdeacon of Oxford, a brother reviser, who went generally with the majority, and did good service to their cause by his excellent edition of the 'Greek Testament with the Revisers' Readings,' wrote thus (on 26 January, 1882) in acknowledging a copy of the 'Glasgow Herald.' He regretted the Bishop's dissent, but on the whole thought that it might not injure the cause in the end :

I do not hold it likely to add to the credit of our work that you should appear as a frequent dissentient, and indeed as adverse to the general methods adopted by the Company. But I never understood that individual Revisers were under any bond to hold their tongues after the publication of the work, and I am not sure that there is not some advantage in the liberty of criticism on the results of the majority in which you and others have indulged yourselves. No outside critic can suppose now that 'the Revisers' hear for the first time from his mouth such objections as Sir E. Beckett and Dean Burgon, in the January 'Quarterly' (the October article stands on different ground), showered upon us so bountifully. Nor can such an objector reasonably doubt that, when his view was advocated in our conclave by such men as yourself, it received the fullest consideration. So I am not sorry, upon the whole, that you have given your protest to the world.

If the reader cares to know my opinion, after sufficient time for reflection, it is that the pedantry and awkwardness of the Revised Version would not strike us as much as the early critics contended, if we heard it read often enough to become thoroughly familiar with it. Rhythm depends very much on accent, and right and seemly accent is a matter of habit quite as much as of rule. The distinction between pedantry and faithfulness is not a very easy one to draw, and I am personally grateful to the revisers for their determination to give a faithful rendering, even at the risk of seeming pedantic. I have seen too much of the mischief caused by the care-

less and superficial revision of the Latin New Testament by St. Jerome, to have any sympathy with the idea that a mere patchwork emendation would have availed to bear the judgment of posterity.

On the other hand I think it was distinctly a misfortune that the Gospels were the first portion of the Bible revised. The Epistles were much more in need of emended translation than the Gospels, and certainly the revisers have made them much more accessible to English readers than they were before. If they could have been circulated in a limited number of copies and exposed to criticism, the revisers would have tested public feeling better, and have been more cautious in regard to the more sacred pages of the Gospels. As it is, we have to take the work as a whole, and to test it by reading it aloud in order to give it a fair trial. In some twenty years' time I hope a further revision will be possible, which will remove some obvious blots from the revision, like 'men in whom he is well pleased' (Luke ii. 14)¹ in the angels' song, but leave the general body of the work to be used concurrently with the Authorised Version.

The most important independent publication of the Bishop in this period was undoubtedly his volume on the Christian Ministry. Its full title is 'Outlines of the Christian Ministry delineated and brought to the test of Reason, Holy Scripture, History, and Experience: with a view to the Reconciliation of Existing Differences concerning it, especially between Presbyterians and Episcopalians' (London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1872). It was dedicated to his *Fellow-Labourers from Scotland*² in the

¹ Dr. Field has shown that *ἄνθρωπος* is not used in Biblical Greek with a qualifying genitive, but that this construction would require *ἐν ἀνδράσιν εὐδοκίας*. The construction *εὐδοκεῖν ἐν ἀνθρώποις* is also the usual one.

² These were Principal D. Brown, of the Free Church College, Aberdeen; Dr. J. Eadie, of the U. P. College, Glasgow; Dr. Milligan, of Aberdeen; Dr. Roberts, of St. Andrews

work of revising the *Authorised Version of the New Testament* in token of sincere esteem and affection, recognising their common desire to 'Love the truth and peace.' The book consists in substance of three lectures delivered by the author in the principal cities and towns of Scotland, especially in the four University cities of Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and St. Andrews. The manuscript had been laid aside, but was taken up after a perusal of Dr. Lightfoot's essay on the same subject attached to his commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, first published in 1868. It is occupied with three main arguments (1) that *a priori*, from the general character of the Church and the analogies of nature, and of the constitution of the Jewish Church, and similar considerations; (2) from Holy Scripture and from history—with answers to objections against the threefold ministry; (3) *ex consequente*, from the consideration of the evil consequences that have followed from the abandonment of the threefold ministry, especially among Presbyterians. The tendency of the book is, therefore, wholly 'apologetic,' to use a technical term, viz. to defend the threefold ministry, particularly the Episcopate, against attacks. There is little or no attempt to treat the duties of the ministry, pastoral and sacerdotal, from a practical point of view. Nevertheless, even in this matter the third head of argument is very interesting and helpful, and it is perhaps the most original portion of the book.

I do not know any treatise in which the student of theology can more conveniently or profitably begin the study of this subject. If he then goes on to read Bishop Lightfoot's 'Essay,' with the Bishop of St. Andrews' 'Remarks' upon it, published (by Parker & Co.) in 1879, and then turns to Canon Gore's 'The Church and the Ministry,' published in 1889, and Professor R. C. Moberly's

‘ Ministerial Priesthood,’ published in 1897, and Professor Sanday’s ‘ Conception of the Priesthood,’ published in 1898, he will have as full a statement of the case from learned and balanced theologians of the Church of England, and from different points of view, as his heart can desire.

The ‘ Remarks’ above mentioned were called forth principally by a sermon entitled ‘ The Burning Bush,’ preached by Dean Stanley, at Glasgow, before a large Presbyterian audience, 27 March, 1879, ‘ in which he put an interpretation on Bishop Lightfoot’s views as favourable to Presbyterianism to an extent certainly not warranted by his arguments taken as a whole. A second edition of the ‘ Remarks’ was published in 1884’ (‘ Public Appeals,’ ii. 616). Stanley’s sermon may be found at the end of the second edition of his characteristic volume of ‘ Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland, delivered in Edinburgh in 1872,’ published in 1879.

The following letter (4 July, 1879) from Bishop Williams, of Connecticut, is a remarkable testimony to the value set on the Bishop’s work by an excellent judge in the sister Church of U.S.A.

Professor Hart brought me yesterday the copy of your ‘ Outlines of the Christian Ministry’ which you were kind enough to give him for me. . . . I shall especially prize this copy as your gift; and, besides, it will enable me to have a clean copy for myself. For it may interest you to know that your excellent book—the copy, that is, which I have long had—has done yeoman’s service in these regions. I have found it so useful for candidates for Holy Orders, and especially to persons coming to us from Congregational or Presbyterian bodies, that it has been kept in constant circulation. Indeed, I hardly see it from one year to another. It—or what is left of it, for it has been dilapidated in its manifold travels—is now in the hands of a Methodist minister who is seeking Orders in the Church.

You will not wonder that I am particularly grateful, not only

for your remembrance, but for enabling me to keep by me a work the value of which I so thoroughly know and appreciate. I wish I could send you something in return; but my work in theology is not to write, but to teach candidates. This year has completed the quarter century of my own Divinity School, from which nearly 250 clergy have gone out into the Church.

I will add here in conclusion the Bishop of St. Andrews' own note on 'Sacerdotalism' prepared for this volume :

All Christians are Priests, as all Israel was a Priestly Nation; but, as under the law, so now under the Gospel there is an unction—a special element of *χάρισμα* (this Principal Tulloch allowed) given to rightly ordained ministers of Christ, by which they are separated from the Laity, to enable them to discharge in a more effectual manner the functions of their sacred office and for the benefit of those to whom they minister—and that there may be no confusion in the Body, but order and good government.

This Dean Stanley denied, and Bishop Lightfoot does not seem to admit ('MS. Note-book,' ii. 36).

CHAPTER VII

RESIDENCE AT ST. ANDREWS AND LAST EFFORTS AT REUNION.

1876-1892

'He who would win the name of truly great
 Must understand his own age and the next,
 And make the present ready to fulfil
 Its prophecy, and with the future merge
 Gently and peacefully, as wave with wave.'

From J. R. LOWELL, A Glance behind the Curtain.

Reasons for the Bishop's removal to St. Andrews—Influence on him of the learned Society there—Retrospect—The 'Church Service Society' founded in 1867—Its influence on Presbyterian worship—The Bishop renews his efforts—Lambeth Conference of 1878—Lord Bute's Breviary—Sermon at the Consecration of Edinburgh Cathedral (1879)—Correspondence with Dr. Milligan (1880)—Duke of Argyll—The 'St. Giles's Lectures' (1880-1)—His criticism in 'Discourse on Scottish Church History'—Its character—Letter from 'A Son of Toil'—Summary of the Bishop's views on Church polity—'Prospects of Reconciliation' (1882) drawn out by Milligan's conduct as Moderator—Dr. Sprott's theory of 'two orders'—How far supported—Presentation of portrait—Invitations to preach in College Church and Parish Church, St. Andrews, accepted (1884)—Letter to Dean Johnston—Archbishop Benson's general sympathy with his efforts—Description of a University Sermon at St. Andrews by the poet Robert F. Murray—Important article on 'Union or Separation' (May 1884)—Its influence on the position of the Bishop at the Seabury Commemoration—Address prepared for that event—Article on 'Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism' (January 1885)—Death of Bishop Christopher Wordsworth (March 1885)—Relation of the Brothers—'The Case of non-Episcopal Ordination Fairly Considered' (3 September, 1885)—'Public Appeals' (two vols.), published 1886—Suggestion that Presbyterian Orders, though irregular, may be valid—Address at Aberdeen University (February 1886)—Invitation to lecture at St. Cuthbert's, Edinburgh—Changes in the Episcopate—Bishop Dowden consecrated and Bishop Jernyn elected Primus (21 September, 1886)—Charge on 'Book of Common Prayer'—Jenny Geddes—Bishop Dowden, with his Chapter, objects to St. Cuthbert's Lecture—'The Yoke of Christ to be Borne in Youth' published (1887)—Letters from Presbyterians and others—Dr. Cunningham's 'Lee

Lecture 'discouraging'—Other publications—'Jubilee Tract'—'Question of a Metropolitan'—Letter to Archbishop Benson—'Ecclesiastical Union between England and Scotland'—Case of the Donatists—Wide proposals of Committee of Lambeth Conference (July 1888)—Charge of August 1888 'On Lambeth Conference'—Invitation to preach before University of Edinburgh: 'A Three-fold Rule of Christian Duty'—The author's own judgment: discussion of principle, precedent, and expediency—These indicate weak points in the Bishop of St. Andrews' scheme—Further opinion reserved—Obvious points emphasized—Duty of co-operation in practical work.

Happy alteration in the Bishop's relation to St. Ninian's—Healthy influence of 'Supernumeraries,' Revs. S. B. Hodson and G. T. Farquhar—Bishop uses Cathedral again 1882 onwards—Death of Provost Burton and appointment of Provost V. L. Rorison—Lord Glasgow's failure: a blessing in disguise—New life of Cathedral (1886-1890)—Consecration of Nave (7 August, 1890)—Verses to G. T. Farquhar—The Provost made Dean and Rev. A. S. Aglen Archdeacon—Charge describing work of General Synod (1890)—Charge 'On Old Testament Criticism' (1891)—Analogy from reaction against Wolfian theory of Homeric poems—Present of a chair and pastoral staff (April 1892)—Continued literary activity—Last Charge read by Dean (October 1892)—Untoward incident—Final words on Reunion—Foundation of 'Scottish Church Society'—Last illness and death (5 December, 1892)—Burial in Cathedral yard.

Summary of the Bishop's public services by Dr. Danson and Canon Farquhar—His supposed egotism—His belief in the reality of the movement among leading Presbyterians—Testimony of Dr. James Cooper.

THE following is the Bishop's own account of the reasons which actuated him in his removal to St. Andrews:

The lease of the house which I had occupied [at Perth] for nearly nineteen years was now expiring, and as my landlord insisted upon raising the rent, which I thought unreasonable (as I had done much and spent large sums in improving both the house and grounds), I determined not to renew it. Had my relations with St. Ninian's been such as I could have wished, I should have been very unwilling to remove from Perth; but as this was not so, and as no other suitable house was to be had in the town or immediate neighbourhood, I was obliged to look out for a residence elsewhere; and the offer of Bishop's Hall, then for sale at a price greatly below the original cost, tempted me to St. Andrews. The situation of St. Andrews at an extreme corner of the Diocese, while Perth was at the very centre, was a serious drawback; but, in other respects, its recommendations as a residence for the Bishop in comparison with

Perth, were great and obvious. The building of Bishop's Hall was larger than I required, though I had then seven daughters at home. But I had means of turning its accommodation to account for the benefit of my clergy, and in other ways. Perth, for so large a town, was deficient in literary society, and, when the trouble of the removal was over, I felt at once a pride and a pleasure in finding myself among men such as Principals Tulloch and Shairp, Dr. Boyd, Professors Baynes, Campbell, Mitchell, Roberts, Crombie, Dr. Rodger and, later on, Professor Knight, to say nothing of the society of occasional visitors during the summer months; while in the other parts of the year the presence of the young men at the university afforded objects of interest of a different and a higher kind.

In another note he mentions also Principal Cunningham (who succeeded Tulloch) as one of those whose acquaintance he made during the later part of his life at St. Andrews, and calls it 'a literary and clerical society nowhere to be surpassed.'

There can be no doubt that this period of the Bishop's life was in most respects far happier than that which had preceded it. It also clearly deepened his conviction of the necessity of making some practical concessions to Presbyterians, in respect to their orders, if reconciliation was to be attained. I attribute this conviction not a little to the personal society of the good and able Presbyterian teachers into which he was thrown, whom he found to be, or thought to be, ready to accept Episcopacy if the manner of its acceptance could be tempered so as to avoid subjecting them to humiliation. He saw what an immense blessing a national Episcopal Church of Scotland would be if it embraced such men, and he saw also that the existing Episcopal Church was unable to claim anything like equality with the Establishment in the number of its learned sons, while in its general hold upon the people it was miserably inferior.

We have seen that at the time when the Bishop intermitted his Reunion work in 1867 the Established Church began to move internally in the organisation of its own forces. In that year the 'Church Service Society' was founded for the study of the Ancient Liturgies and the preparation of suitable offices for public worship¹—thus using the liberty which Dr. Robert Lee had vindicated for the Clergy of his Communion. The formation of the Society was suggested by Dr. Sprott, an independent inquirer in this field. The Society took its origin among the Glasgow clergy, on the invitation of Mr. George Campbell, Minister of Eastwood. Naturally its leaders were what could be called 'High Churchmen,' viz. Principal P. C. Campbell, of Aberdeen, Mr. Campbell, and Dr. Sprott; but though Dr. Lee did not favour it, younger men of his school, 'Broad Churchmen of the older type,' such as Principal Tulloch and Dr. Story, joined it, and the latter especially took a prominent share in its formation.

Its chief work was the remarkable 'Euchologion' or 'Book of Common Order,' which has passed through many editions and is extensively used. It provides forms for the two great Sacraments, and for the sacramental acts of Marriage and Ordination, and also for Burial. It has provided for the orderly reading of Holy Scripture, and revived the celebration of Marriage in church, and the use of a Burial Service at the graveside. It has helped to restore the observance of the chief Festivals of the Church by the provision of Lessons and Collects. Principal Tulloch was instrumental in procuring the insertion in it of the Nicene Creed.

This movement went on side by side with such Liturgical developments and enrichments as we have been

¹ In the following sentences I have followed Dr. James Cooper, *The Revival of Church Principles in the Church of Scotland* (Oxford, 1895).

familiar with in England in the form of Children's Services, improved Hymnals, restored Churches, and the like. The Holy Table came, in some (now perhaps in many) churches, to have its proper place of honour; organs, painted windows, and the like were introduced; the cross is frequent in monuments and on the outside of churches. Communion every quarter (instead of once or twice a year) is now common, and a monthly, or sometimes more than monthly, celebration is not unknown.

A knowledge of this movement, and the healing influence of time in regard to his own troubles, gradually enabled the Bishop to recover from the 'great despondency' which was noticed in his Charge of 1875. It will be seen from the Suggestions as to the Catechism printed in Appendix III at the end of this volume, that the Bishop took very little direct part in the Lambeth Conference of 1878, being only present at the first day's session. He presented to it, however, the draft of his important 'Suggested Addition to Church Catechism,' which afterwards received the approval of the Episcopal Synod in Scotland. The first fresh effort on his part, in the direction of his old Reunion enterprise, may perhaps be found in the sermon which he preached at the Consecration of St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh (30 October, 1879)—a noble building, especially in its interior, given to the Episcopal Church by the piety of two sisters, Barbara and Mary Walker, and probably the most important material instrument which it has received in this century next to Trinity College, Glenalmond. The sermon, entitled 'More than Solomon is here,' was evidently intended to conciliate the Scottish mind by showing the general advantages which such an institution possesses, rather than to sound a note of triumph. Of it he writes to his sister-in-law, Miss M. Barter :

If it had any merit it lies in its *abstinence* from anything *very* demonstrative. I have learnt that the Scotch mind is not to be *carried by storm*, as the English mind may be ; and therefore I believe it was not unsuccessful *here*, though in England perhaps *more* would be expected on such an occasion.

Another timely publication at this date was an article on the Marquess of Bute's 'Translation of the Roman Breviary' (a book in 2 vols. 8vo.), which appeared in the 'Edinburgh Courant' of 16 December, 1879. The publication of which the article was a critique was not likely, in its original form—and it is now very scarce—to pass into many hands. The Bishop did a service to the Church by pointing out publicly some of the salient features of the Breviary, as compared with the Prayer Book, its cumbrousness and complexity, its addresses to saints of prayers that ought to be addressed to God, its retention of ridiculous legends and apocryphal matter, its large use of human words as 'Lessons,' and its comparatively small and very inconvenient use of Scripture. The reviewer also does not fail to indicate a certain bold and independent treatment of his material on which the Marquess had ventured.

This, however, was rather an excursus of a congenial sort than a definite step in the Reunion movement—except so far as it might show the anti-Roman, but fair and courteous, controversial spirit of the reviewer. Next to the Edinburgh sermon I should count among such steps (and it was a much more decided one) a correspondence with the late Professor Milligan, of Aberdeen, whose friendship the Bishop had made over New Testament Revision. The latter wrote to me that the Bishop did not write much to him, and, as he (Milligan) went to St. Andrews once a year or so, he contented himself with the hope of seeing him personally there.

But from time to time letters passed between them, and

the following is important enough to be inserted here. It is dated Bishopshall, 19 April, 1880.

No truer words were ever spoken than some which I see you are reported to have used in your last Croall lecture. 'To speak of making the world believe in a Risen Lord by mere Bible circulation or missionary exertion was to waste time and strength, unless it were attended by the spectacle of Unity,' &c.

I have often said the same; but, as coming from one in your position, I rejoice to think it is infinitely more likely to carry weight. I also quite agree with you that there has been 'too much speaking about unity and too little action.' I have not only spoken much—perhaps too much—but have also done some little—though perhaps too little (though the best I could see my way to)—and now I shall look to you to help me to do more, or at least to invite me to march under your standard, with its admirable motto, 'Visible Unity and (Mutual) Helpfulness.' For some twenty years I have used daily the enclosed prayer,¹ and would gladly do anything more *you may recommend*.

The following was the answer, dated Aberdeen, 24 April:

'Visible Unity and Mutual Helpfulness.'

Let the excellent motto stand. I think that I should have it printed at the top of the note paper I am to use, that it may be constantly before my own eyes and those of my correspondents.

I am greatly pleased that you should have found anything to give you satisfaction in the newspaper report of my last lecture. . . . By and by I shall have to publish the lectures and shall then have to try and speak out. What am I to do now? I really do not well know. I fear that I am not fit for much action, and thinking that we have had plenty at least of general speech, I too often sit moping in my own den here and let things go their way. There can be no doubt, however, I imagine, as to the great necessity which exists for a thorough reviewing on the part of all our Christian bodies of the whole situation. The solution

¹ Probably the prayer for Unity from the Accession Service, with a clause specially applying it to Scotland. See Appendix III. p. 358.

offered by the mere fact of Disestablishment seems to me so short-sighted and so imperfect, that I can hardly think that even those most eager about it can thoroughly believe in their own panacea. I can hardly resist the conviction that there must be widespread beneath the surface the feeling that something more is necessary. You have lived long enough among us to know the hollowness of our Church cries.

Other letters followed on both sides, and the outcome, though not immediate, was doubtless a drawing together of two single-minded and wise-hearted men who between them laid the foundations of separate pillars that must some day grow together into an arch in the Church of God.

The Bishop, notwithstanding his kindly feeling to Presbyterians of a certain class, was nevertheless at all times on the alert to criticise and demolish inaccuracy in argument on their side, and in his Charge of 1880 ('Public Appeals,' ii. 616) he had occasion to notice a slip of the Duke of Argyll's, when he laid down, in a speech at Ballachulish, that Episcopacy grew out of Presbytery just as the Papacy grew out of Episcopacy, and urged his countrymen not to sacrifice any part of their ancient traditions, viz. of antagonism to this development. The Bishop's answer naturally was that the Papacy was no natural outgrowth of Episcopacy, but was due to the historical fact of the Pope's being Bishop of Rome, the capital of the civilised West. The Papacy was really the enemy of Diocesan Episcopacy. In the East Episcopacy had all along been universal, without giving birth to a Papacy, or acknowledging it in its Western form. The Duke's argument, therefore, though specious, was devoid of real cogency.

A more important opportunity of gaining the public ear was, however, given him from another side a few months later.

In the winter of 1880-81 twelve of the Presbyterian

clergy were selected to deliver what were called the 'St. Giles's Lectures,' first in Edinburgh and afterwards in Glasgow, on the subject of Scottish Church History. These lectures were in many respects commendable, but some of them deserved comment and criticism, not only those dealing with the period of the Reformation, but more particularly the eighth lecture, by Dr. Story, dealing with the reign of William III., which had much of the 'keen east wind' about it. The Bishop of St. Andrews, whose 'Discourse on the Scottish Reformation,' published in 1861, showed his large command of historical material, was naturally asked to provide some counterbalancing considerations. He delivered two lectures in St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh, on two successive Sundays, 8 and 15 May, 1881, which were afterwards published under the title, 'A Discourse on Scottish Church History from the Reformation to the present time, with Prefatory Remarks on the St. Giles's Lectures and Appendix of Notes and References' (Wm. Blackwood & Sons). The Prefatory Remarks are an elaborate review of the St. Giles's Lectures, which much enhance the value of the 'Discourse.' They show clearly enough the difference of opinion that existed among the lecturers, and add largely to our knowledge of the topics treated by them. The 'Discourse' itself is full of much matter for thought. It is based on four words—Reformation, Restoration, Revolution, Disruption. It must be confessed that the tone is rather sad, and has more in it of the lamentation of Hebrew prophecy than of the exulting hopefulness of Scottish patriotism. While Bishop Wordsworth was conscious of the strong points of the Scottish character, he was, I think,¹ constantly repelled by its want of intelligent orderliness as understood by an Englishman. And his subject, in almost every aspect of it, suggested reasonable grounds for criticism. He had,

of course, no affection for the spiritual revolution which ruthlessly separated the Church of the Reformation, in Scotland far more than in England, from the Church of the past, though he strove to do justice both to Knox and to Melville. He had little or no sympathy for nonjuring Jacobitism in his own communion, which he called 'infatuation' and 'attempting to live on a Romance.' He was equally out of harmony with the claim of Presbyterianism to be established 'by the will of the people'; and, while he admitted the noble and magnanimous character of the Free Church disruption movement of 1843, he thought it, like the nonjuring attitude of the Episcopal Church, a kind of 'martyrdom by mistake.' There was, therefore, little to please him in the general movement of Ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland, though of course it was possible to look with satisfaction on many actions of individuals, and to discern in it as a whole the signs of God's Providential care in overruling the wills of men.

The Bishop had the satisfaction of receiving from his publishers, Messrs. Blackwoods, a note, dated 9 June, 1891, stating that a generous friend of the Church, who desired to remain anonymous, had ordered 1,000 copies of this lecture, 500 to be sent to Ministers of the Church of Scotland and 500 to Free Church Ministers.

He also valued the following from an anonymous correspondent, a Presbyterian working man :

Right Rev. Sir,—Emboldened by your letter in the 'Scotsman' of the 20th, I beg to offer you my sincere congratulations on the noble sentiments expressed by you in your animadversions on the *St. Giles's Lectures*; believing as I do you will not under-rate the same, though they come from the pen of a humble working man, who is also a Presbyterian.

In the first place those lectures were open to challenge from the fact that several of those men who were singled out as worthy of the high honour were not men whom we look upon

as champions of our faith; nay as true, genuine representatives of Presbyterianism at all. What is worse, some of them are men who have occasionally given expression to sentiments calculated to strike at the very roots of our common faith. No doubt some of them are men of distinguished talents and keen discrimination, of whom we may justly be proud; but through many of the lectures there exhibited itself a spirit of exultation and foolish bravado which (at this time especially) it ill becomes any branch of the Christian Church to manifest. What, however, I liked worst, and what you by example corrected, was the tendency to overlook and ignore the overruling of Divine Providence. This is one of the more decided forms which Infidelity assumes in the present day; and that it is gradually creeping into our Churches we are not without proof. I rejoice in the honest Christian integrity of men who like you are valiant in the open rebuke of such a spirit, and in the open avowal of a constant belief in God the Father, as well as in His Blessed Son. I congratulate you on the testimony of a good conscience which must undoubtedly be yours, and envying those who enjoy your personal friendship, I am, with sincere respect,

Your obedient servant,

A SON OF TOIL.

A Country Parish, 21 June, 1881.

This may perhaps be a fitting place in this Memoir to sum up the Bishop's views on the whole question of Church polity. As far as I can analyse his belief it consisted mainly of three articles:

First that the Bible, as well as reason and experience, taught that Episcopacy was right;

Secondly, that an Establishment of religion, according to the Bible, was part of God's will;

Thirdly, that the Synodal system, in which the laity were to have their proper place, was necessary to the Church of the future, and in accordance both with primitive Church principles and present conditions of Church life.

It is difficult to say which of these three articles he held with greater tenacity than the others: I have been struck with his strong attachment to the second. For though he would have granted free toleration to all who stood outside an Established Church, he clung ever to the duty of having a national representation of religion. He was, however, no Erastian, and he spoke in the strongest terms of the injury done to the position of his own Communion by its acceptance of the 'Assertory Act' of 1669, which put the disposal of the external government and polity of the Church at the mercy of the Crown. As regards the Episcopal Church he was much opposed to the importation of Englishmen to fill important charges in it, and he felt that everything possible must be done to prepare the way for a union between it and the Established Church, while the main principle of Episcopacy was preserved.

He had dropped any direct action tending towards Reunion, as we have said, in the year 1867 (see Chapter V.). The proceedings of the General Assembly of 1882 encouraged him to renew his efforts. The closing Address of Dr. Milligan, of Aberdeen, was, as might be expected from the letters printed above, a remarkable utterance for the Moderator of such an assembly. The Bishop naturally took it for the text of his Charge delivered in the Autumn, entitled 'Prospects of Reconciliation between Presbytery and Episcopacy.' 'It may be said (he asserts) I believe with truth, that a nobler or more memorable manifesto, if I may so call it, has never proceeded from the occupant of that chair.' He notices also the kindly motion of Dr. Tulloch, whose friendship he made about this period as Principal of St. Mary's College. Incidentally he praises the institution of the General Assembly as the backbone of the Presbyterian Church and as giving it a great and paramount

advantage over the Episcopalian. He quotes, too, with approval, my predecessor Bishop Moberly's last Charge of 1882, in which he spoke of the necessity of 'building up a central body, not a Synod of the clergy, but the Synod of the Church framed upon true Church principles,' evidently a body of clergy and laity working together, as in the United States and the Colonial Churches generally. The remainder of the Bishop of St. Andrews' Charge is taken up with a discussion of the theory of the 'twofold ministry' chiefly in answer to Dr. Sprott, who argued in favour of 'two orders,' Presbyters and Deacons. This latter theory (as the Bishop noticed) has some arguments in its favour from the Apostolic Constitutions, and the teaching of medieval schoolmen, and even of Hooker, who drew a distinction, in one place at least, between 'two orders' and 'three degrees,' counting Bishops and Presbyters both to belong to the order of Presbyters. (See 'E. P.' v. 78, sec. 2, 5, 9, 12. He does not, however, make use of this distinction in his later books.) Field, Mason, Forbes of Corse, and Usher are also referred to as favouring it, though he did not accept it himself.

I may remark, in passing, that this method of distinguishing the clergy has received a certain confirmation, since the Bishop wrote, from the inquiry into the so-called Canons of Hippolytus, a document supposed originally to have belonged to the beginning of the third century and to the Church of Rome. In this document we find the same ordination formula prescribed both for Bishops and Presbyters, to be used only with a difference of name. The evidence also that the practice of ordination *per saltum*, which is thus implied, was primitive and long continued in the Church of Rome, though not new, has received greater currency. That is to say, it is now understood that a man might be ordained to either of the three degrees without

passing through the lower ranks, and especially might be made Bishop without first becoming Presbyter.¹

Immediately after the delivery of the Charge of 1882, just referred to, it was arranged that the Bishop should be presented with his portrait painted by Mr. H. T. Munns of London.² It was hung in the room, and represented the Bishop delivering his last year's Charge on the Revised Version. The presentation was made by Captain Oswald of Dunnikier, who spoke of the unanimity and readiness with which the proposal to present the portrait had been received, and stated that it was intended to be an heirloom in the family. The Bishop expressed his thanks, as might be expected, in a short review of his relations to the Diocese and of the progress made in it, adding :

The two features in our progress which I regard with most satisfaction are, on the one hand, the general softening, and to a great extent entire disappearance, of prejudices against us on the part of our Presbyterian brethren ; and, on the other hand, the increased interest now taken by our own laity in the affairs of our Church, and the zeal and energy which many of them show in their earnest desire to promote its welfare and advancement.

The next few years saw the Bishop's advance to the furthest point of reconciliation with the Established Church to which he felt it prudent to go. In January 1884 the 'Senatus Academicus' of St. Andrews offered him, through Principal Tulloch, an honorary degree, giving him a choice between the LL.D. and the D.D. He chose the latter ; and it was conferred on 17 February. This gave him a position in the University in close proximity to which he lived, and he felt it a sort of duty to do something in return in the

¹ The evidence on both these points is referred to in our *Archbishops' Answer to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII. on English Ordinations*, chaps. xii.¹ and xiii.²

² Exhibited in the Royal Academy, 1883. See frontispiece.

way of a theological thesis.¹ Hence when he was addressed by the students generally asking him to give them a sermon, and also by the members of a Students' Missionary Association, including young men of different denominations, with a like request, he was ready to listen to both invitations. This led to his preaching in the College Church on Sunday, 9 March, with the full approval of Mr. M. Rodger, the Incumbent, and on the Sunday after in the Parish Church, of which his friend Dr. A. K. H. Boyd was Incumbent, at the special service held once a year for the Students' Missionary Association.

His reasons for taking these steps, and the limitations which he wished to be put upon them as precedents both for himself and others, were explained to the Diocese in a printed letter, dated Bishopshall, 17 March, 1884, and addressed to the Very Rev. N. Johnston, then Dean of the Diocese.² He explained the peculiar circumstances of both cases; and pointed out that it could not be inferred that he was therefore willing to preach in any Presbyterian Church on any occasion, or that his example might be pretended by the clergy to justify them in so doing. At the same time he implied that such further advances were rather a question of opportuneness and expediency, than forbidden by law or principle. He took the opportunity of reiterating some

¹ He received the same degree from the University of Edinburgh in the same year, two months later, at their Tercentenary (17 April, 1884). This naturally weighed with him in accepting invitations to St. Cuthbert's and St. Giles's. He habitually wore both hoods, one in Lent and one in Advent: see below, p. 337.

² Dean Torry had died in 1879, and the Bishop attended his funeral (Friday, 19 December). He writes of his successor (23 January), 1880:—'I have appointed Mr. Johnston, of Kirkcaldy, to succeed Dean Torry. He is the senior Presbyter of the Diocese, being as old as I am, and that is a disadvantage; but, all things considered (and there are some that required very careful and anxious consideration), I could not see my way to do better. He is a man of sound judgment, and I feel that I can depend upon him.' Dean Johnston died, quite painlessly, in his sleep in September 1890.

of the general considerations on reconciliation which were familiar to him, and quotes the following from a Charge of the then newly-created Archbishop, delivered as Bishop of Truro in 1883 to his Diocesan Conference :

I would not spoil by an indistinct word the practical views of such papers as we heard last year. I would only enforce them by reminding you of the near approaches (formerly incredible) to each other of the Scottish Episcopal and Established Presbyterian Churches. When we think of their history so ennobled and so stained, so inveterate on both sides and so heroic, and mark their attitude to-day, the hardest man may believe that it is no will of God that any devotion and faith should war for ever against faith and devotion ; or the folds of the flocks stand ‘like cliffs that have been rent asunder’ and ‘dreary seas flow between’ them hopelessly and unalterably. Let me commend to any who have not read them—as voices of promise for the whole Church—the closing address of Dr. Milligan, Moderator of the General Assembly of 1882 ; the Speech of Principal Tulloch in the same Assembly ; and the first part of Bishop Charles Wordsworth’s Charge in the Synod of the United Diocese.

The Diocese practically approved of his action by passing *unanimously*, at the next Synod, a resolution thanking him for what he had done in the cause of Union.

The impression made by a similar sermon at St. Andrews (for he continued to preach once a year in the College Church¹) has been recorded in the following frank and pleasant letter from a young St. Andrews’ poet, Robert F. Murray, author of ‘The Scarlet Gown’ and other poems. The letter is dated (Sunday) 17 April, 1887,

¹ See *Public Appeals*, ii. 614 and 669 foll. *note*. The last entry in his Diary of such a sermon is Second Sunday in Lent (26 February) 1888. Similar sermons were preached, with his approval, in the same Chapel by the Bishop of Ripon (W. B. Carpenter) and Dr. Danson, of Aberdeen. At the same time, it is to be noticed that he did not approve of English Bishops or clergy preaching, without consulting him, in such churches, much less making a practice of going to Presbyterian places of worship *in preference* to those of the Episcopal Church.

and was evidently written just after the sermon, and without any idea of its going beyond the person who received it. Its writer died, aged thirty, in 1893.¹

There was a University sermon, and I thought I would go and hear it. So I donned my old cap and gown and felt quite proud of them. The preacher was Bishop Wordsworth. He goes in for the union of the Presbyterian and Episcopalian Churches, and is glad to preach in a Presbyterian Church as he did this morning. How the aforesaid union is to be brought about I'm sure I don't know, for I am pretty certain that the Episcopalians won't give up their Bishops, and the Presbyterians won't have them on any account. However, that's neither here nor there—at least it does not affect the fact that Wordsworth is a first-rate man and a fine preacher. I dare say you know he is a nephew, or grandnephew, of the poet. He is a most venerable old man, and worth looking at merely for his exterior. He is so feeble with age that he can with difficulty climb the three short steps that lead into the pulpit, but once in the pulpit it is another thing. There is no feebleness when he begins to preach. He is one of the last voices of the old orthodox school, and I wish there were hundreds like him. If ever man believed in his message Wordsworth does. And though I cannot follow him in his veneration for the thirty-nine Articles, the way in which he does makes me half wish I could. . . . It was full of wisdom and the beauty of holiness, which even I, poor sceptic and outcast, could recognise and appreciate. After all, he didn't get it from the Articles, but from his own human heart, which he told us was deceitful and desperately wicked. Confound it, how stupid we all are! Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Unitarians, Agnostics; the whole lot of us. We all believe the same things, to a great extent; but we must keep wrangling as to the data from which we infer these beliefs. . . . I believe a great deal that he does, but I certainly don't act up to my belief as he does to his.

¹ It may be found at p. xxv of Mr. Andrew Lang's *Introduction* to the volume of Murray's *Poems* published in London in 1894. The 'scarlet gown' is, of course, that worn by students at St. Andrews, as at some other Scottish Universities. (See below, p. 304.)

Between September 1882, when he returned to the subject of Reunion, and September 1885, when he delivered his most important Charge dealing with it as a matter of practical policy, there were signs both of encouragement and discouragement to the movement. Individual Presbyterians of distinction spoke and wrote strongly and affectionately, amongst whom the foremost were probably Dr. Cunningham, in his Lecture on Dr. Robert Lee; Dr. Cameron Lees, writing on Bishop Ewing among 'Scottish Divines'; Dr. Milligan, in the 'Catholic Presbyterian,' September 1883; Mr. John Parker, Minister of Cleland, in the preface to a Sermon entitled 'The Body of Christ,' and Dr. James Cooper (now, I am glad to think, Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Glasgow), in a Sermon on the 'Reconstruction of the Scottish Church.'¹ On the other hand, later meetings of the General Assembly had been much less favourable than that of 1882; nor had Presbyterians as a body recognised the help given to them by Episcopalians in their opposition to Disestablishment.

The germ of the Bishop's own deliverance of 1885, and of his final policy, is to be found in an article entitled 'Union or Separation,' published in the 'Scottish Church Review' for May 1884, and afterwards as a pamphlet, which was largely circulated, and therefore was not reprinted in his 'Public Appeals.' It is to be found in this sentence there printed in italics (p. 11) :

Can a reconciliation between Presbyterians and ourselves be effected upon the understanding that the adoption of the three-fold ministry is eventually to be accepted as the basis of our agreement—the existing generation of Presbyterian clergy being left free to receive Episcopal ordination or not, at their own

¹ All these are mentioned in more detail in *Public Appeals*, ii. 669, together with the invitation he received from the Principal and Professors of the University of Aberdeen to address the students.

option ;¹ and that in the meantime we are to work together with mutual respect, and with no unkind or unbrotherly disparagement of each other's position.

The Article 'Union or Separation,' appearing in May 1884, undoubtedly alarmed some of his brethren, and this alarm led to the very regrettable incident of his being denied his proper position as Senior Bishop (in the absence of the Primus) at the *Seabury Commemoration*.

The following is his own account of it :

The principal event of this year in our Scottish Church was the *Seabury Commemoration* held at Aberdeen, Wednesday, 8 October, which passed off in a way which gave, I believe, a general satisfaction and evoked, as it justly might, considerable enthusiasm. To me personally, who, as senior Bishop, in the absence of the Primus, had the right to preside, certain circumstances connected with the arrangements (especially after I had good reason to expect a different result, which led me to prepare an opening address) were disappointing and vexatious, and upon them it will be better to maintain silence. But I record with no little pleasure and gratitude the kind hospitality I received in the house of Dr. and Mrs. Ogilvie Will, and the opportunity I enjoyed of making the personal acquaintance of the Senior Bishop of the American Church, Bishop Williams of Connecticut, with whom I had held sympathetic correspondence many years before respecting the novel teaching which was springing up in the Church of England on the subject of the Eucharist. The gathering included representative men from every portion of the Anglican Church, English, Irish, American, and Colonial ; and the Secretary of State for Scotland, the Marquess of Lothian, an

¹ *Original Note.*—There can, I suppose, be no doubt whatever that at the Restoration of the Monarchy and Episcopacy in 1660-61, a very large proportion of the clergy who had not received Episcopal Ordination were allowed to remain in their parochial charges upon no other condition than that of acknowledging the office and authority of the Bishop of the Diocese. Dr. Grub writes: 'None of the Bishops, except Bishop Mitchell [of Aberdeen, who died early in 1663], insisted on re-ordaining ministers who had received only Presbyterian ordination, though they did not refuse to do so when asked' (iii. 215); and see Burnet's *Own Time*, i. 252 and *note*. [The last words are added in pencil in the Bishop's private copy.]

old pupil of mine at Glenalmond, presided at the banquet given on the principal day.

One who was present at the latter records the 'great enthusiasm' with which the Bishop was received on proposing the toast of 'the Episcopal Church of Scotland.'

He prepared, as above noted, a valuable historical address, which contained nothing but what might have been heard with attention and admiration, for the meeting in the Albert Hall in that city of October 8. It would be easy to give an account of this incident, putting his action in a favourable light, but he evidently wished it to be treated with reserve, and I shall make no further reference to it. The address itself is valuable as vindicating the Archbishops and Bishops of England from any charge of complicity with the delays of conferring the Episcopate on the American colonies, and for pointing out some reasons for the policy of the Government in denying that boon. Here, as elsewhere, his historical facts are marshalled in succinct and telling order, and no one writing on this subject would be wise to neglect this address. He also took occasion to speak of the 'Scottish Office,' and to praise the manner in which the American Church had dealt with it, and to express a hope that his own would follow its example at any rate in the wording of the Consecration prayer. Reunion is only just glanced at in the warnings as to the necessity of remaining in sympathy with Scottish national life with which the address closes.

This address was warmly approved by the Bishop (H. Browne) of Winchester, who wrote (15 October, 1884): 'I wish it had been delivered. Every portion of it has my fullest sympathy and assent. . . . I cordially agree in all that you have written about the Communion Office.'

He also republished as 'A Contribution to the Seabury Commemoration' his Oxford Ramsden Sermon of 1857 on

‘The Mending of the Nets,’ a sermon on ‘Confirmation as an Ordinance Scriptural and Apostolic,’ and ‘Eucharistical Offices, English, Scotch, American,’ in one pamphlet, which he dedicated ‘To my Rev. Brethren the ex-Moderators of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland.’

In January 1885 he was led to express himself on the subject of two reprints of ‘Archbishop Hamilton’s Catechism’ of 1552,¹ one of them issued by the ‘University Press,’ at Oxford, with a Preface by Mr. Gladstone. The Catechism was undoubtedly a cautious and moderately worded document, and Mr. Gladstone adopted the opinion that it represented a policy on the part of the Scottish Bishops to follow in the lines of the Reformation in England under Henry VIII., where for instance Bishop Tunstal of Durham wrote against Papal Supremacy, but without cutting himself off from the traditional teaching on many subjects. The Bishop of St. Andrews did not deny that there were Churchmen of the type of Bishop Tunstal in Scotland, of whom he specially named John Mair or Major, Provost of St. Salvator’s College, St. Andrews, but he did not believe in the breadth of any such movement among the Bishops. His essay was of practical importance to his Reunion scheme; for, if there had been such a tendency, it would have made the work of Knox and his fellows much less necessary or justifiable, and have rendered it less possible to consider them as representatives of a true national uprising against priestly tyranny. His discussion of this topic is well worth reading, and, in my opinion, he proves his point.

The spring of 1885 was saddened by the death of my father, who had just resigned the See of Lincoln, on 21 March. This was the end of a constant loving intercourse, especially by letter, between two men who were

¹ In an article of 21 pp. in the *Scottish Church Review* (No. I. of vol. ii.).

closely allied in sentiments and interests, and who consulted one another in regard to almost every important literary enterprise. Few Churchmen of their age used the printing press more freely, and each valued the other's judgment, though both were independent in their attitude towards public questions. It would be easy to draw a parallel and a contrast between them, but the latter, certainly, would be to some extent unreal, because of the very different circumstances of their lives. I at any rate prefer to think of them both with deep and almost equal reverence, which increases as I grow older, and as experience teaches me to see the superior force of character and public spirit with which God endowed them both, and, I would add, some others of their generation, even in comparison with many of the foremost men of our own day. I sometimes ask myself how my father would have regarded his brother's action of 1885 and 1888. I have no direct evidence except my knowledge of his greater cautiousness of temper and stronger reverence for tradition. He would, of course, in any case have recollected and tried to enter into the special circumstances of Scotland, of which he knew that his brother had a far deeper knowledge than himself. A few years before his death he wrote as follows to an intimate friend :

The Bishop of St. Andrews may not perhaps be allowed to see the good effects of his sayings, writings, and doings ; but, like other good and wise men, he has planted trees under the shade of which future generations will sit, and from which they will gather fruit.

These various writings and incidents prepared the way for his remarkable if somewhat indefinite Charge of 3 September, 1885,¹ 'The Case of Non-Episcopal Ordination

¹ In August 1885 I was unexpectedly offered a nomination to the See of Salisbury on the part of the Crown, and, after accepting it, was glad to take counsel with my uncle. He was kind enough to meet me at Edinburgh for

fairly considered.' After some preliminary statements about the threefold ministry being 'the historical backbone of the Church,' and showing how the Papacy has engrossed the functions and reduced the status of the Episcopate, he sketched lightly the condition of things in Scotland, and emphasised the point, which had long impressed him very strongly, that, after the Restoration, Scottish Episcopacy was Erastian, and Presbyterianism the contrary. He then proceeds ('Public Appeals,' ii. 695) :

If this were so, may it not of itself form a ground for believing that the grace of valid ordinances, and consequently of a valid ministry, would not be withheld from a body of professing Christians, who, with the Bible held firmly in their hands and clasped devoutly to their inmost hearts, had succeeded in extricating themselves and their country from a degrading bondage? And in that respect, at least, might they not even seem to claim with greater reason the name of Church, inasmuch as they had vindicated more strenuously the rights of its Divine Founder, which their more legitimate rivals had too often pusillanimously and faithlessly surrendered?

He then goes on to affirm that the question of the validity or invalidity of Presbyterian ordination has never been treated from our side with the breadth of argument of which it is capable. It is easy to draw up, as he had done thirty-four years before, a catena of Anglican Divines in favour of the exclusive validity of Episcopal ordination, but none of these authorities refer to our Lord's test, 'By their fruits ye shall know them' (Matt. vii. 15-20). And most of these passages refer to *regularity* and *good order* rather than absolute *validity*. No Anglican would deny that ordination properly belongs to Bishops; but those who say so need not always be held to pronounce an opinion in regard

several happy days (7-10 September), just after his Charge was delivered. I saw him again, this time in weakness, at St. Andrews in October 1888.

to the effects of ordination performed otherwise. Bishop Andrewes, in his answer to Peter Moulin, a French Protestant, had used the same word as Carpzov did in describing the Anglican position, 'Potestas ordinandi Episcopis solum competit,' but further on he (Andrewes) adds :

'It does not, therefore, follow that a Church cannot stand without Episcopacy; for a man must be blind who does not see Churches standing without it;' only (he argues) looking to the example of all antiquity, every Church that has lost ought to endeavour to recover it, 'ubi Deus dederit, et res ferent'—i.e. when God shall grant the opportunity and circumstances shall permit ('Opusc. Posth.' p. 191; see also p. 211); a passage quoted with approval by Archbishop Bramhall (iii. 518).

He points out that our Divines not only recognised Presbyterianism, when adopted as a necessity, in preference to Romanism—as Hooker, Dean Field, Bishop Cosin, and Archbishop Wake did—but even when that necessity had been removed they contemplated the continuance of the Divine favour in the case of Churches which, to use the words of Archbishop Bramhall, not only 'through new necessity,' but 'through ignorance, or new-fangledness, or covetousness, or practice of some persons, have swerved from the Apostolic rule and primitive institution.' In another place Bramhall notices the distinction between a valid and a regular ordination (Bramhall's 'Works,' iii. 475, cp. 517). Bishop Wordsworth also cites (as he did several times) Bishop Gray's remark addressed, in his own name and that of the other Bishops of South Africa, to the Dutch Reformed ministers at the Cape: 'We do not doubt that the Holy Ghost works in the conversion of souls to God in and through your ministry. It would, in our judgment, be sinful to doubt this. Wherever there is godliness there must be grace and the author of it.'

There is no definite proposal made in this Charge, but

it was evidently intended to be read in the light of the article 'Union or Separation.'

This Charge was the last of his collected 'Public Appeals on Behalf of Christian Unity,' of which he published twelve parts, with valuable connecting Introductions, ranging over more than thirty years (1854-1885). The first Introduction is dated 25 January, the last 31 July, 1886. In the latter he refers thus to the Charge in question ('Public Appeals,' ii. 680 foll.):

I was fully aware that the main argument of that Address was not likely to prove acceptable to some at least of the stricter and more rigid members of our own body. And perhaps I was less careful than I ought to have been in stating the precise point which I undertook to maintain. In the first place I do not maintain that *all* non-Episcopal Ordination is valid. It may be not only schismatical but heretical. In the next place I am only concerned with Presbyterianism which is not heretical but orthodox; and with Presbyterianism which has a history to show of struggles against despotism, of hardships and persecution, which provoke our repugnance against those who inflicted rather than against those who suffered them. Fitted to that History my argument is only an extension of the ground taken up by the great English divines when they held that the non-Episcopal Ordination of the foreign Protestants was justifiable and valid under the treatment which they received from the Church of Rome and from their own Bishops who adhered to that Church; or rather (considering the deep and mysterious character of the whole subject) the view which I wished to take was not so much to *assert the positive* side of the argument except as probable, and under all the circumstances, fully admissible, but to *repudiate the negative*—viz. that our Presbyterian ministers as regards their Ordination are no better than laymen.

He then goes on to say that, on the whole, he considers the testimony of our Church to be that such orders are valid, though irregular, where there is no conscious departure

from the Catholic Faith. He instances St. Augustine's rule that, where a Schismatic or Heretic comes over, Catholics, while curing his schism or heresy, do not repeat any Sacraments he may have received, 'lest while we aim at curing defects we condemn divine remedies' ('De unico Bapt. adv. Petil.' c. 3).

The friendly intercourse with Dr. Milligan and his colleagues naturally led to an invitation from the neighbouring University of Aberdeen, where the Bishop delivered a lecture to the students, in February 1886, in the Hall of Marischal College, 'On the True Perspective of Christian Duty,' with the motto *Donec perveniamus omnes*. He speaks first of Unity of the Faith in reference to the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; then of Unity in the imitation of Christ—touching on imperfect ideals like those of the Freemasons, Good Templars, and other societies; lastly, of Unity in the Ministry, touching on the much-needed reform in the formula of subscription imposed on Scottish ministers, and the necessity of an unprejudiced study of the seventeenth century. There is, perhaps, rather an air of constraint and some want of definite aim in this address, though, as usual, it contains much that is excellent.

In May of the same year he received a similar, but even more liberal, invitation from Dr. Macgregor, of St. Cuthbert's, Edinburgh, asking him to address the members of his Young Men's Christian Association some Sunday evening in church during their usual winter course, and, if he chose, to urge upon them the claims of his own system. He accepted the invitation generally, though preferring, and, I think, wisely and rightly, to speak on another subject. The See of Edinburgh was then vacant by the death of Bishop Cotterill on 16 April. It was first offered, by a very large majority of votes, to Canon H. P. Liddon, who

was then travelling in the East. Among his reasons for declining was one which must have pleased my uncle—the absence on his part of any Scotch blood, and his dislike to hear the Church in Scotland described as the *English* Church, and his fear that his acceptance would further that misdescription. It was not till 6 August that Dr. Dowden, the Pantonian Professor, was elected. He was consecrated on 21 September, all the Scottish Bishops and Bishop Lightfoot, of Durham, taking part. The Bishop of St. Andrews, as senior Bishop, was the principal consecrator.

Another change took place at the same time, which must here be chronicled, the election of a new Primus. Bishop Eden had for some years been in bad health, and since July 1885 had had the help of a coadjutor, Bishop Kelly, late of Newfoundland, who had recently given valuable aid to my predecessor, Bishop Moberly, in his declining years.¹ The Primus died in August 1886, and my uncle (though in his eightieth year) was prepared to accept the office if it had been offered to him; but, as the ‘Glasgow Herald’ put it, he was passed over as ‘too friendly to Presbyterians.’ He was, however, almost at the same moment exposed to a rather severe experience of ‘odium theologicum’ on their side.

His Charge of 2 September, 1886, had been on ‘The Study, Use, and Value of the Book of Common Prayer.’ This Charge is remarkable as containing a very striking catena of testimonies to its value from Churchmen, lay as well as clerical, Nonconformists, Presbyterians, Americans, and foreigners. In the concluding part of this address he mentioned with approval the restoration of daily service in St. Giles’s, Edinburgh, but could hardly omit disapproval of

¹ Bishop Moberly died 6 July, 1885. I was consecrated Bishop of Salisbury 28 October.

the inscription recently put up in honour of the rough brawler who interrupted the Dean when he was reading one of the most beautiful of our Collects, that for the Seventh Sunday after Trinity. This was met by a violent article in the Established Church organ, called 'The Scottish Church,' which was privately resented by his Presbyterian friends, though they did not think it necessary to make any public remonstrance.

When the See of Edinburgh was filled my uncle thought it right to inform the new Bishop of his promise to Dr. Macgregor, and to ask whether he would give his approval, or at least tacit consent, to its fulfilment, promising to accept his decision. Bishop Dowden consulted his Chapter, which, on the whole, was unfavourable. I have before me my uncle's letters to the Bishop (18 October, 1886) accepting this decision, and to Dr. Macgregor (20 October) announcing and giving his own explanation and defence of it.

His letter to the Bishop of Edinburgh contains the following interesting reminiscence :

I remember just thirty years ago, three years after I became Bishop, I was requested by a Young Men's Christian Association in Perth to give the concluding lecture of their winter course (which was held in the St. John's *East* Church on a Sunday evening) with the *full concurrence* of the minister of that Church, Mr. Murdoch (long since dead); so much so that he called upon me and begged me also to give the introductory lecture of the same course which had been assigned to him! I acceded to the former request, but when the matter got wind the young men were threatened with the interference of the Presbytery, some of whom were *shocked* at the notion of a *Bishop* being allowed to preach in one of their churches; and so my lecture was given up. I mention this to show that no change has taken place in my own views upon such a case.

And now I can sing: 'Solve senescentem,' &c. &c. Only the participle ought to be in the *passive* voice.

This last little hit may be forgiven in an old man writing to a young one.

Unfortunately the matter was not allowed to drop. Dr. Macgregor did not forget, and did not allow others to forget, that Dean Montgomery had given such a lecture at St. Cuthbert's without interference on the part of Bishop Cotterill; and it was also stated untruly in one or more of the newspapers that Bishop Dowden had *inhibited* his colleague. The position was difficult for them both; but, though some friction was for a time generated, it did not cause any lasting soreness. The Bishop of St. Andrews set a high value on his colleague's learning, as well as his personal kindness. The principal result was that the lecture was printed and given to all the members of the Association by the author, and was probably more read than it would otherwise have been. It was entitled 'The Yoke of Christ to be Borne in Youth,' and was one of the most successful and characteristic of such productions of the Bishop's pen.

The Bishop received many appreciative letters concerning it, as well as appreciative printed notices. Amongst others may be named a reference to his long labours in 'Two Sermons' preached by Professor Ince before the University of Oxford, and letters from Mr. Shorthouse, the Bishop of Aberdeen, Dean Boyle, and Dean Montgomery.

Amongst communications from Presbyterian friends the following words from a letter of Dr. Roberts of St. Andrews are interesting, and probably represent a large section of feeling among pious and enlightened men of his communion.

You cannot possibly exaggerate the evil of present disunion among the Churches—especially of Scotland. But what can be done? So far as I see *nothing*, until the Westminster Confession is got rid of; and to attempt to meddle with that would at once lead to disestablishment. 'All seek their own'—the

various sects aim only at their own aggrandisement—and union on any basis seems hopeless, until the national conscience awakes to the sin of *διχοστασίαι* (Gal. v. 20). I do not myself believe that any form of Church government can claim a *jus divinum* in the strict sense of the words. But, of course, episcopacy has the *prestige* of antiquity, and seems to me, in some important respects, the most expedient. At the same time, I think that there are very valuable elements to be found both in Presbyterianism and in Independency.

Another from Dr. Cameron Lees expresses his great sorrow at the non-delivery of the lecture, and adds ‘Among the mass of people who do not understand Ecclesiastical punctilio I find a deep feeling of indignation.’

Another from Dr. Campbell Fraser, of the University of Edinburgh, contains the following :

In this perplexed and divided state of the Church it is refreshing to breathe the air with which you surround us. Surely it cannot fail in the end to improve the health of Scotland ecclesiastically, though unity of the visible Ecclesiastical organisations may be far away.

The Anglican branch of the Church has seemed to me the most likely *centre* for this unity—if it should ever come about—with the strong presumption of history and of most of Christendom in favour of its Episcopal constitution.

To bring all the sects to see this is the difficulty which writings like yours should, if any can, help to overcome.

The year 1887 saw Bishops everywhere preparing for the Lambeth Conference, and my uncle looked out for encouraging omens. Unfortunately (as was too often the case in his life) the most prominent omen was discouraging. Dr. John Cunningham, who had succeeded his friend Tulloch as Principal of St. Mary’s College, and who also was personally friendly to himself—and had indeed recently asked him to his official dinner as Moderator of the General Assembly and wished him to propose the toast of the evening, ‘the Health of the Church of Scotland’—delivered

the Lee Lecture for that year on the question, 'Is a Union of the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches possible? If not, is Federation?' He did not conceal the facts that there were 'many circumstances highly favourable to the possibilities of Union,' and that 'there is now much more uniformity of worship in the Churches of England and Scotland than there was twenty years ago,' and 'a common danger which is drawing the two Churches together;' but his statement of the objections was stronger than of the possibilities, and he answered both questions in the negative. My uncle took this Lecture for the basis of his Charge (delivered on 1 September, as usual, in the Cathedral, Perth), and certainly showed that the conclusions were not so inevitable as the lecturer had made out—citing many testimonies of Presbyterians in favour of the conclusion that Scotsmen were not so attached to Presbyterianism as they had been. Principal Cunningham spoke strongly of the necessity of the repeal of the English Act of Uniformity. Why should he think that the repeal of Scottish Acts which were antagonistic to Episcopacy should be out of the question? He spoke, too, of the proposed 'absorption' of Presbyterians in the Episcopal Church: the Bishop did not intend this, but wished to see 'the Presbyterian National Church made such that Episcopalians, without dereliction of principle, can seek admission into it; or in other words, such that a good Catholic Christian can properly belong to it; by which (in this relation) I mean one who cannot be content to live without Episcopacy, and consequently without the ordinance of Confirmation.' Precentor Farquhar speaks of this Charge as lasting an hour and a half, and as exhibiting 'magnificent pertinacity and wonderful power.'

Other publications of this year were 'A Jubilee Tract for the People of Scotland,' containing a summary of the arguments in favour of Episcopacy, with some pages from a

Jubilee Sermon on 'The Evangelisation of the Heathen,' and a letter reprinted from the 'Scottish Guardian' of 5 August, 'On the Question of a Metropolitan.' The former contains a characteristic anecdote of Dean Stanley, with whom he had made friends in his later years, especially in the matter of their joint congratulation to Lord Beaconsfield (in English and Latin verse) upon his return from the Berlin Congress in July 1878.¹ Stanley in bidding good-bye to him at Megginch Castle in 1879, said: 'I have been reading with pleasure your 'Remarks on Lightfoot'; you are the kindest of controversialists,' and, taking him cordially by both hands, whispered loudly in his ear, 'We have not been quite fair to James!'² They never met again. Stanley died in 1881.

The letter 'On the Question of a Metropolitan' is distinctly against the proposal, which was being mooted again after ten years. Besides the arguments which would naturally occur to any one who considers the subject—such as those that concern the difficulties connected with election in conciliating the rights of the Diocese and the rights of the whole Church, which have proved so troublesome in Ireland—there are others which specially concerned the statements of the memorial, and the particular case of Scotland. The recent determination of Canada, and of the Cape, Australia, and the West Indies (1897), to have Archbishops has, however, made it more natural that Scotland should have its Metropolitan, if not its Archbishop. It may perhaps be asked why the present system should not go on, only changing the 'Primus' into a 'Primate.'³ But

¹ This will be spoken of in the next chapter, with other fugitive compositions.

² Of course the Bishop of Jerusalem, whose position is one of the recognised arguments for the early institution of Episcopacy.

³ The Bishop of St. Andrews, in his Charge of 1890, p. 7, wrote: 'I was inclined to prefer the name of "Primate" (for which there is good authority

the prior necessity is surely to have a regulation for the periodical meeting of the General Synod, and to make provision, that, at any rate in matters of this kind concerning external order, the laity should be properly consulted.

The autumn of this year (4 October, 1887) saw another and a last change of residence, the move from Bishopshall to a smaller but very pleasant house upon 'the Scores,' in full view of the bay, its rocks and countless seagulls, which the Bishop called Kilrymont, after the old name of the city of St. Andrews—said to mean 'Cell on the King's Mount' and to refer to the retirement of Constantine III. to Kirkheugh in 943. The following is his own account of it:

After my brood of twelve children had been more than fledged, and most of them had left the nest, I felt that I was incurring unnecessary expense in continuing to occupy a residence so spacious as Bishopshall, and I was glad to be able to get rid of it upon reasonable terms and to remove into a smaller house, just then built, on the Scores, in a delightful situation overlooking the sea. Unhappily the removal involved the breaking up of my large and valuable library, a laborious and a melancholy operation; because, from want of accommodation in my new abode, it became absolutely necessary to get rid of a portion of the books, and the proceeds of the sale, partly in Edinburgh and partly in London, of many which I was loath to part with, were sadly disappointing. In all other respects, when the trouble of the change was over I had every reason to be thankful that it had been accomplished. It did not materially diminish our domestic comfort, and it enabled us to effect a material reduction in our annual expenditure.

both ancient and modern) rather than retain "Primus," when parity had been abandoned. . . . I cannot suppose that the change as it now stands will be of long duration.' The name 'the Scottish Church' was introduced into the Code of 1890 as equivalent to 'Episcopal Church in Scotland.' Why should not the chief Bishop now be called 'Primate of the Scottish Church'? It is more difficult to revive the title Archbishop where St. Andrews and Glasgow both have the tradition of it, and Edinburgh deserves it. There is, however, precedent for an 'Archbishop of the Scottish Church' in the modern 'Archbishop of the West Indies,' not attached, I imagine, to one see.

In this sad business of the books Canon Farquhar gladly lent his aid to catalogue and divide, and in the process learnt much both of the books and of the owner's character. The library, when I knew it, several years later, was still a very useful one, especially in books bearing on Scottish Church History, and it will be a great advantage to the Chapter of St. Ninian's to possess it. According to Canon Farquhar's Diary, the books removed to Kilrymont were 6,000 in number, and it took him a week to put them in that 'exact order' in which the Bishop delighted, and which he expected from all who were willing to be ruled by him.

The Lambeth Conference was summoned to meet under Archbishop Benson in July 1888. In preparation for it my uncle printed a letter of some forty pages octavo, dated 24 May, and entitled 'Ecclesiastical Union between England and Scotland,' and addressed it to him as President of the Conference, in which he advocated the treatment of the subject under heading III. of the Agenda, 'The Anglican Communion in relation to the Scandinavian and other Reformed Churches.' This is one of the most effective of his writings, and sums up the experience and hopes of a lifetime with masterly simplicity, courage, and dignity. His great precedent for the recognition of Presbyterian orders is that of the fourth century treatment of the Donatists. This is the kernel of the whole, and shall be quoted here, that the reader may keep it firmly in view in case he has to give a practical judgment on the question—and every reader, male or female, of a book of this kind is likely to have occasion to influence opinion on the question at some time or other in his or her life. It may be found on p. 19 foll. of the 'Letter.' He had been speaking of the case of the Novatians, about which there is, I think, something more than uncertainty

(see Chap. III. p. 62 on Presbyterian Baptism). The words in square brackets are his own corrections. I have omitted the references to authorities contained in footnotes.

Next we have the case of the Donatists. About this there can be no uncertainty. The thirty-seventh canon of the 'plenary Council of the whole of Africa,' held at Hippo, at the instance of St. Augustin, in A.D. 393, not only leaves no room for doubt as to the concessions actually made upon the point in question, but lays down the everlasting principle which determined it, and which is closely applicable to the case we are now considering. The canon itself is to be found in Bruns, i. 139. I quote the following from the translation of Fleury, edited by Newman (p. 226) :—

'A decree also was made with reference to the reunion of Donatists in these words: "Former Councils have forbidden the admission of Donatist clergy to the same rank in the Church, allowing them only lay Communion. . . . But whereas the lack of clergy in the African Church is such that some places are totally destitute, it is decreed that those shall be excepted of whom it can be ascertained that they have not rebaptised, *as well as those who shall desire to be admitted with their flocks to the Communion of the Church Catholic.* For we ought not to doubt that the good of peace and the sacrifice of charity effaces the evil which these last, *misled by the authority of their forefathers,* have committed by rebaptising. This decree, however, shall not be confirmed until the Church across the sea—*transmarina*—has been consulted." That the decree was confirmed, and consequently, we may conclude, with the approval of Rome and other transmarine Churches, is manifest from numerous letters of St. Augustin of subsequent date, which speak of the matter as so determined and so acted on. It adds not a little to the force of this decree that former Councils had taken, as it admits, a different and a stricter line. And the ground which it alleges, "the lack of clergy," as compared with the number of the [Donatist] clergy, is precisely that of our own case in Scotland; and, humanly speaking, as we are going on at present—if not in the great towns, in rural districts—it must take centuries to recover our lost ground. Now it is difficult to perceive any principle upon which the whole African Church could accept Donatist Ordination as valid, and not accept Presby-

terian Ordination conferred under the circumstances in which this country was placed through the action of the unreforming Bishops at the time of the Reformation, and again, through the action of the reformed Bishops at the time of the Revolution. That the Donatist Bishops [clergy?] were not required to be reordained when they joined the Catholics, any more than they were required to be rebaptised, has been clearly proved. And yet the Donatist separation had much less to say in its excuse than the Presbyterian separation had, at least in Scotland; and it can scarcely be argued that greater validity attaches to a ministry when in schism, merely because it happens to be Episcopal, as was that of the Donatists (though Episcopal of a very questionable kind, for the consecration of Majorinus, their first Bishop, was, according to Optatus, "unlawful"), than to a ministry which is *bona fide* Presbyterian and which was believed by its first founders to be Scriptural and Apostolical; rather the reverse might be inferred, according to the maxim, "corruptio optimi pessima."

He then speaks of the difficulty arising from the acknowledgment of Roman Orders by the Church of England, while it does not acknowledge Presbyterian Orders; but he observes that this may be explained by the facts (1) that our succession was 'through the Romanised channel,' and (2) Presbyterians had shown themselves very hostile to Episcopacy, denouncing it as contrary to Scripture, and even anti-Christian and diabolical, and in some cases favourable to Anarchy.

He then cites Keble on Hooker, 'E. P.' vii. 14, 11 (Preface, p. cxxvi.), and other instances of Presbyterians employed in the Church of England. And amongst modern divines he cites Bishop Barry, then Primate of Australia, and Bishop Gray, of Cape Town, whose words have been already quoted in these pages (see above, p. 243).

I was staying at Lambeth at the time when this letter reached the Archbishop, and he asked me to acknowledge it for him, which I did as follows (6 July, 1888):

The Archbishop, who is unable to find time to write himself, has asked me to acknowledge your printed letter as well as the private one which accompanied it. He has read the published letter twice over with great interest and very full and hearty sympathy. He desires me to say that you have been placed upon the Committee appointed to consider the question of the reunion of the different bodies into which English-speaking Christianity is divided. I forget its exact title. The Bishop of Carlisle [H. Goodwin] is the convener, and it is a strong body. I give the names overleaf. I am glad that you feel yourself able to serve. . . . The Archbishop thinks that Novatian's consecration was irregular but not invalid. I read your draft resolutions to the Conference, as I, alone, of those you named, had time to speak.

Committee No. IV. Sydney [Barry], New York [Potter], Jamaica [Nuttall], Brechin [Jermyn], Rupertsland [Machray], Ripon [Boyd Carpenter], Manchester [Moorhouse], St. Andrews, Edinburgh [Dowden], Clogher [Stack], Nelson [Suter], Adelaide [Kennion], Minnesota [Whipple], Carlisle [Goodwin], Antigua [Branch, Coadjutor].¹

I did not understand that the Archbishop committed himself to all the propositions of the letter written by my uncle; nor, I think, did the latter so regard it. But no one of the Archbishop's character could read such a letter written by such a man without great sympathy.

My uncle, who was then at Rydal, where he had lately taken great delight in renewing old memories, came up to London and attended several meetings of the committee, especially on the 16th and 17th, and then returned to Rydal. To the second of these days he puts the note in his almanack 'Deo Gratias.' His account of it in a contemporary letter (24 July) is as follows:

¹ The names actually attached to the report are 17: Sydney, Adelaide, Antigua (Coadjutor), Brechin, Edinburgh, Hereford* (Atlay), Jamaica, Lichfield* (Maclagan), Manchester, Minnesota, Nelson, New York, Ripon, Rochester* (Thorold), Rupertsland, St. Andrews, Wakefield* (How). Those marked with an asterisk (*) must have been added to the Committee after the Report was first presented. The Bishops of Carlisle and Clogher must have been too much occupied with other Committees to serve on this.

Our Committee consisted of fourteen, with the Bishop of Sydney (Barry) for Chairman, who did his part admirably. This morning I have received a proof of the Report agreed upon; and I enclose a copy of the two most important resolutions, which I am sure you will be glad to see. They follow closely upon the lines recommended in my pamphlet. The crucial one (No. 2) moved by me and seconded by the Bishop of —, was carried with *only two* dissentients! The English Bishops (4) were all in favour of it. This is highly encouraging; and I came away from the last meeting thanking God that He had permitted me to live to see the day, and feeling that I might now sing ‘Nunc dimittis.’ For though, of course, one cannot yet tell what may be the result when our Report is presented to the Conference (which will be done this week), yet it is certain that such a resolution, passed by such a Committee of Anglican Bishops from all parts of Christendom *almost unanimously*, cannot fail, sooner or later, to bring forth the fruit which we desire. The Bishop of Nelson, who came away with me from the meeting, remarked that no such important business had been done in the Church of England since the Savoy Conference.

In order to understand this letter it is necessary to have before us the words of the Report and the Resolution (which were published by the Bishop of St. Andrews in his Charge delivered about a month later (29 August), under the title ‘The Lambeth Conference and Church Reunion,’ pp. 11-12). I am therefore breaking no confidence myself in reprinting them, though otherwise I should have hesitated to do so. The committee first laid down its ‘quadrilateral’ basis, viz. Holy Scripture, the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds, the two great Sacraments, and ‘the Historic Episcopate, locally adapted, in the methods of its administration, to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church.’ It then went on to speak of the duty of holding brotherly conferences with the representatives of other chief Christian Communions in the English speaking races. Afterwards followed a passage referring

to the article about 'the Historic Episcopate,' and continuing :

But they observe that while the Church in her 23rd Article lays down the necessity of the ministry as a sacred order, commissioned by those 'who have public authority given unto them in the congregation,'¹ and while for herself she has defined the latter term by insisting in her own communion on Episcopal ordination, she has nowhere declared that all other constituted ministry is null and void. They also note that in the troubled period following the Reformation (up to the year 1662) ministers not Episcopally ordained were in certain cases recognised as fit to hold office in the Church of England, and that some chief authorities, even in the High Church School, defended and acted upon this recognition in England, Scotland, and Ireland. The question, therefore, which presents itself to them is this—whether the present circumstances of Christianity among us are such as to constitute a sufficient reason for such exceptional action now? To this question—looking to the infinite blessings which must result from any right approach towards reunion, not only in Great Britain and Ireland, but in the American and Colonial communities—looking also to the unquestioned fact that upon some concession upon this matter depends, humanly speaking, the only hope of such an approach—they cannot but conceive that our present condition, perhaps in a higher degree than at any former time, justifies an affirmative answer. They therefore humbly submit the following resolution to the wisdom of the Conference :—

'That in the opinion of this Committee, conferences such as we have recommended are likely to be fruitful under God's blessing of practical result only if undertaken with willingness on behalf of the Anglican Communion, while holding firmly the threefold order of the ministry as the normal rule of the Church to be observed in the future—to recognise, in spite of what we must conceive as irregularity, the ministerial character of those ordained in non-Episcopal Communions, through whom, as ministers, it has pleased God visibly to work for the salvation of

¹ The Committee ought, I think, to have added the words defining the object of the authority 'to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.' This is what Presbyters as such have *not* received, according to the belief of the Church of England. See below, p. 260.

souls, and the advancement of His kingdom; and to provide, in such way as may be agreed upon, for the acceptance of such ministers as fellow-workers with us in the service of the Lord Jesus Christ.'

The Report was recommitted by the vote of a large majority, and this passage, in consequence, struck out.

The Charge of August 1888, from which we have already quoted, is the last of the Bishop's great public utterances on Reunion. He describes what took place at the Lambeth Conference, and goes on to say that he was not surprised at the action of the majority. He would have preferred to have dealt with the Presbyterianism of Scotland and Ireland separately, and to distinguish between those who profess to derive their ministerial character from *above* and those who are content to receive it from *below*. But the very broad and extensive proposal actually made naturally alarmed the Conference, especially as it had not much time to discuss it. As to the proposition which he advocated, he looked upon it as a suspension or dispensation of a general rule, not an abrogation of it. In addition to the authorities quoted by him from time to time he instances the motion of Dr. Rorison of Peterhead, already referred to in these pages, and expresses his opinion that his motion was in accordance with the opinion of the late Bishop of Aberdeen ¹ (see above p. 158).

It was no doubt in consequence of these efforts that the Bishop received a request from a more distinguished Presbyterian body, perhaps, in Scotland than any that had as yet asked for his services as a preacher—the University of Edinburgh. This was contained in a letter from Sir Wm. Muir, dated 25 November, 1888, desiring him to preach the Commemoration sermon at the Graduation ceremony on

¹ Provost Rorison, writing on 15 February, 1889, to the Bishop, expressed some doubt as to Bishop Suther's heartiness in such ideas, although, while his father lived, Suther was much influenced by him.

Thursday, 18 April, 1889. He was not at this time in very vigorous health, but he determined to do his best for the University of which, as of St. Andrews, he was an honorary D.D. 'I must try to gather up all my energies for that sermon,' he said to Canon Farquhar in the early spring; and he was able to do so very effectively. It was entitled 'A Threefold Rule of Christian Duty specially needed for these times,' and was based on St. Paul's words, 1 Thess. v. 21, 22: 'Prove all things: hold fast that which is good: abstain from all appearance of evil' (or, as he notes, R. V. 'every form of evil'). The sermon has a certain fitting academic flavour, and is remarkable for its wealth of illustration from history and literature as well as theology.

It is now right, I think, that I should give my own judgment as far as is possible upon this grave matter.¹ Our determination in regard to it must turn, I suppose, on three closely allied considerations, those of *principle*, *precedent*, and *expediency*. Consideration of *principle* is by itself insufficient, since the form of the ministry is not directly matter of revelation. But it may seem, and does seem to myself, to have two lines, first that in which we all agree with those Presbyterians who have taken up the matter with any desire of Reunion, viz. that a *ministerial succession* was intended by our Lord and His Apostles, and that it is a note of the true Church to carry on this succession. The second line of principle is, that this succession must be carried on by those, who, *with the general consent of the Church, had received the commission to carry it on*, first Apostles, then (in the case of 'Barnabas and Saul')

¹ Besides the well-known larger books on the subject of the Ministry, I may mention two pamphlets which I have found useful: *The Attitude of the Church of England to Non-Episcopal 'Ordinations'*, by Rev. Walter K. Firminger, B.A., of Merton Coll. Oxford (Parker, 1894), and *The Future of the Church in Scotland*, by Rev. Cosmo Gordon Lang, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, Edinb. 1895.

the prophets of Antioch, then Apostolic delegates like Timothy and Titus, then Bishops generally. It is just possible that a college of Presbyters might have had from Apostolic times a commission, upon the decease of their president, to select and consecrate another president, as it is by some supposed to have been the case in Alexandria. But this would not be a real precedent: such Presbyters being really Bishops *in posse*, as Canon Gore calls them. The stronger case would be that of the Chorepiscopi and City Presbyters referred to in the obscure thirteenth canon of Ancyra, which does, I confess, seem to me to make it probable that in that abnormal and enthusiastic country of Phrygia, those who were next in rank to Bishops—much like the Canons of a Cathedral Church or the Cardinals at Rome—had claimed a certain right to ordain Presbyters and Deacons. The canon (so interpreted) confirms them in the right, provided the Bishop gives them a written delegation. This would harmonise with the claim of Presbyters, admitted in the East, but not in the West, to act as ministers of Confirmation, a privilege to which the condition has been attached that they must use chrism blessed by a superior Bishop or Patriarch. But neither of these supposed and doubtful cases, which I will call (for the sake of argument) Alexandrian and Phrygian, established itself in the Church at large as a precedent for Presbyterian ordination; and it is remarkable that the contrary precedent, the rejection of the ordination of Ischyras, ordained by a Presbyter Colluthus, comes to us from the Church of Alexandria in the fourth century, showing that the principle of Presbyterian ordination was not recognised there.

As to the Donatist case, it differs from the Presbyterian, to which my uncle sought to apply it, in this particular, that there was no dispute about the proper form of orders between the Catholics and the Donatists. The latter had

wished to continue a regular succession. But the Presbyterians broke off from the rest of Christendom very largely on this point: not only not caring for Episcopacy, or rather rejecting it, but not even at first caring for the sacramental sign of laying on of hands. Their succession, even as a Presbyterian succession, is very doubtful. To make the cases parallel we should have to show that the Donatists who conformed were allowed to teach their schismatic doctrines as long as they lived, provided that the next generation dropped them. But their conformity showed, of course, that they *had* dropped them. This was all that was really needed. Whereas Presbyterians, conforming on the conditions suggested, would still be Presbyterians, though, like many now living, they would not object to their children being different to themselves.

Further the Church was *one* in those days, and what could be done by a united Church in the way of a suspension of, or a dispensation from, a general rule, can hardly be done even by so important a body as the Anglican Communion in regard to so serious a departure from the general rule of Christendom.

So much as regards *principle* and *precedent* of an ancient type. As to modern precedents, no doubt there is a strong case as regards Scotland, after the Restoration; but it is a case which is not satisfactory in respect to its success. It issued in a more lamentable state of disunion and hatred than any previous attempt at reconciliation in Ecclesiastical polity—no doubt partly owing to the unwise Jacobitism of the Bishops. The English precedents are different. They are partly individual opinions, differing from one another and from the general stream of Church policy, like those of Hooker, Bramhall,¹ and Cosin; partly

¹ Bramhall's *practical* judgment must be taken as expressed in the cautious language of his letters of orders given to Mr. Edward Parkinson, a

cases of individuals allowed to minister, as far as we can judge contrary to law, in England; partly the toleration of a certain amount of Presbyterianism in the Channel Islands,¹ and the employment of Lutheran ministers in the Missions of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in India. None of these precedents is strong enough to commit the Church of England as a body to the position that a Presbyterian succession is valid. The Scottish precedent again was under the pressure of royal authority and does not sufficiently represent Church principles.

Lastly we come to *expediency*, to which we have already incidentally referred in the last paragraph, speaking of Scotland after the Restoration. Would the union established, *ex hypothesi*, on the Bishop of St. Andrews' method, be likely to be a lasting one? Would it not be such a mingling of different parties, uniting without perfect conviction, as would leave a far from solid teaching body and a weak disciplinary system to the next generation? I cannot help thinking that though the Bishop never changed his opinion, he was conscious of this serious difficulty.

I have my own opinion as to how the matter might possibly be settled at some future day, with less sacrifice of principle than was involved in the Bishop's scheme, and yet without injustice to the natural feelings of the Established Church of Scotland. I will not, however, encumber this chapter with a discussion of it, particularly as I am unwilling to

Presbyterian minister in 1661. See Bramhall's *Works* in A.-C. L. i. p. xxxvii. The form was 'Non annihilantes priores ordines (si quos habuit) nec invaliditatem eorundem determinantes, multo minus omnes ordines sacros Ecclesiarum forinsecarum condemnantes, quos proprio Iudici relinquimus, sed solummodo supplentes quicquid prius deficit per Canones Ecclesie Anglicanae requisitum, et providentes paci Ecclesie, ut schismatis tollatur occasio, et conscientiis fidelium satisfiat, nec ulli dubitent de eius ordinatione aut actus suos presbyteriales tanquam invalidos aversentur.'

¹ The present Bishop of Winchester doubts whether the amount is as large as has been supposed.

use this opportunity in a way that might hamper my brethren, the Bishops of the Scottish Church, who have the main responsibility of representing our communion in that country. But I may be permitted to emphasise such obvious points as these, (1) that likeness of aim must come before alliance, and (2) alliance before inter-communion, and (3) that both Episcopalians and Presbyterians have much to learn from one another. The chief practical lesson of this memoir seems to me to be that common work, as in New Testament Revision, and free association, as in the University of St. Andrews, will instinctively lead good and wise men to desire closer union; and, therefore, that individuals who desire to advance that cause will do well to seize all fair opportunities of co-operation, which do not compromise the principles they are bound to uphold. Without such co-operation aspirations are feeble, and hostility and prejudice are readily and almost inevitably cherished in silence, if not expressed in bitter antagonism.

Leaving now this fascinating subject, we must return to describe the great change in the relation of the Bishop to St. Ninian's Cathedral which took place in this period. In 1878, after the Precentorship had been two years vacant, Provost Burton agreed to make certain changes in the ritual and the Bishop permitted him to appoint the Rev. Donald J. Mackey as his colleague in June of that year. In the same year the Rev. S. B. Hodson, once a theological student at Glenalmond, became 'supernumerary' of the Diocese, acting as pastor of the Cathedral congregation, and being at the Bishop's disposal for occasional duty on the Sundays. This useful office had begun in 1873, but had lapsed, I presume, during the troubles. Mr. Hodson was naturally brought into more frequent contact with the Bishop than the other members of the staff, and succeeded in restoring something of the old relation between him and

his Cathedral. In 1882 the Charge on the 'Prospects of Reconciliation' was delivered there, and this henceforth became the rule. In 1883 the Rev. George T. Farquhar succeeded Mr. Hodson, and continued the same pleasant relation with an even more filial affection. Provost Burton died in July 1885, and soon after his death the present Dean, Rev. V. L. Rorison, was chosen to succeed him (21 August). His excellent work at Forfar, to which sphere he was advanced by the Bishop's means (to succeed his friend and pupil, Mr. Shaw), strongly recommended him to the Bishop, and Lord Glasgow fully concurred in the appointment. The new beginning seemed most hopeful, when in the course of the next month (19 September) it was discovered that Lord Glasgow's endowment, amounting to a capital sum of some 9,000*l.*, was in no way secured, and was needed to pay his debts. Happily Lord Forbes's endowment of the second stall, amounting to some 200*l.* a year, was intact, and on Mr. Mackey's resignation this vacancy was opportunely filled by Mr. Farquhar.

Lord Glasgow's failure called out the sympathy of many to the Cathedral who had hitherto stood aloof, especially of the Earl of Strathmore; and it was really a blessing in disguise. By the end of February 1886 the new Provost felt himself justified in resigning Forfar and in entering upon his new office, into which he threw himself with immense energy. Since that time the Cathedral has entered upon quite a new phase of its existence. A new body of Prebendaries took office, even before the Provost came into residence, and the Cathedral almost immediately took its proper place in the city of Perth as well as in the Diocese. Nay, in August 1888 the Episcopal Synod met there. The year 1887 had seen such an increase in the congregations as to make the building of the nave almost a necessity. To this was added a project for a more imposing

single western tower, of which part only, however, has been built. On the whole something like 8,000*l.* was spent upon the building and its adornment in the years 1886 to 1890, when it was consecrated on Thursday, 7 August, by the Bishop, the preacher being the present Archbishop (Mac-lagan) of York, then Bishop of Lichfield; the Archbishop (Lord Plunket) of Dublin preaching in the evening. Since that time much has been done, including the purchase of a Deanery House.

Since the Bishop's death 1,100*l.* has been collected towards a memorial to him, which is to go towards the building of a Chapter House, to which his library has been presented by his sons. I am rejoiced to learn (September 1898) that this building is likely to be commenced next spring, and to have reason to thank and congratulate Lord Rollo who has shown special interest in this worthy commemoration of his old friend.

It has been necessary to chronicle much that was painful in the Bishop's relations to St. Ninian's. It is satisfactory to close our review of them with the following sentence at the end of a Pastoral Letter, dated St. Andrews, 12 November, 1890, drawing attention to the fact that the Cathedral had now received its final and complete recognition by the Church at large, through the new Canon (ix.) of the revised code of the General Synod, and asking for help to its funds. After quoting from his sermon on his enthronement in 1853, the Bishop concludes :

When those words were spoken, nearly forty years ago, the tone of warning in which they were conveyed was not altogether unnecessary, and as this will perhaps be remembered by some among you, it may be well to add that the occasion for it now is, I am thankful to say, quite gone by. The institution, as at present conducted, possesses, I gladly assure you, *my entire confidence*; and I feel that I can safely recommend it as worthy—eminently worthy—of yours.

The Provost was the chief instrument in collecting funds, but Canon Farquhar also did his part to conciliate goodwill, and this, perhaps, may be a fitting place to quote the Latin verses in the style of Catullus, addressed to him by my uncle, not only in his Office as Precentor, but as a poet—on the occasion of the publication of his volume of Sonnets—in June 1887. The version is the Bishop's own.

Salvere jubeo te Poeta jam noster !
 O! si quid olim in conditore Thebano,
 Lapides canendo qui movere callebat,
 Accidere posset te canente tam belle !
 Tum quam repente surgeret Cathedralis
 Perfecta moles ! Tumque cordibus gratis
 Quot vota caelo solverentur exultim ;
 Et qui Poeta es conditor fores noster.

I bid thee hail, who art become our Bard.

O! that Amphion's wonder-working lyre,
 Which built the walls of Thebes, might be transferred
 To thee who sing'st so sweetly ! All entire
 How swiftly then would our Cathedral pile
 Rise up ! how full would the exulting strain
 Of thanks to Heaven be raised ! And thou, meanwhile,
 ' Building the lofty rhyme ' wouldst build our Fane.

The early months of 1890 were saddened by two severe family bereavements, the death of Mr. Macdonald (3 January), who had married his daughter Margaret, at Rydal, less than five months previously, and that of his much-loved youngest son, who had successfully passed ' through the ranks to a commission,' who was found drowned in the Severn, 14 April. The latter was Roundell Palmer's godson, and bore his name, together with that of my eldest uncle John.

The Bishop was able, however, to confirm in the Cathedral early in May, and to attend the General Synod,

at which he preached the opening sermon (3 June) on 'Religious Toleration not to be confounded with Indifference to Religious Truth.'

The request from his colleagues to preach this sermon was a mark of that confidence on their part which cheered and brightened his later years. Dean J. S. Wilson writes to me as follows, and I believe with great truth :

If I may say so, the Bishop's relations to his brethren were never so cordial as in the last two or three years of his life. Bishop Ewing of his earlier contemporaries seems to have been the only one who thoroughly appreciated him ; and after Bishop Ewing's death he stood very much alone. Towards the end of his life—from what I have heard both from himself and others—he was more than any other the peace-maker in the not infrequent conflicts and misunderstandings that occurred, especially those in connection with the proposed revision of the Scottish Communion Office in 1889-90.

I should, however, say that his relations with the Primus (Bishop Eden) were generally those of hearty cordiality and agreement, though occasionally he came into conflict with him, e.g. in regard to the commission touching Père Hyacinthe (M. Loyson), which he thought too great an interference with a neighbouring church.

On the death of Dean Johnston (which occurred 18 September), the Bishop appointed the Provost of St. Ninian's Dean, at the Diocesan Synod (held 3 November), and requested the Synod to concur in the appointment of the Rev. A. S. Aglen, Incumbent of Alyth, as Archdeacon of the Diocese. He had given up the idea of having a Coadjutor, receiving such Episcopal help as he needed, particularly from his kind neighbour the new Bishop of Glasgow (Right Rev. W. T. Harrison, consecrated 29 September, 1888), but he required some assistance in the way of internal oversight. The following were his instructions given to the new officer. They may be of interest to those

inquirers who are occasionally puzzled as to what 'archidiaconal functions' are.

Duties of Archdeacon.

(a) Generally to be the 'eye of the Bishop' *oculus Episcopi*. 'Burn,' i. p. 93a, 96a, 96b.

To act 'universaliter' as *Episcopi Vicarius* in the Diocese (the Cathedral excepted).

(b) Particularly—

(1) To present to the Bishop such as are to be ordained, having examined them as the Bishop's principal Chaplain (p. 96a).

(2) To put into possession such as are presented, instituted and inducted (*ib.*).

(3) 'Jurgia ad ejus pertinent curam,' *ib.* p. 93 (Isidore Hispalensis at the beginning of seventh century). On his relations to the Dean, see *ib.* p. 97b.

The Charge of October 1890, though not the last delivered by the Bishop, was the last separately published. Besides dealing with the Cathedral, it enters at length into the work done by the General Synod. It may be convenient to the reader to know the principal points of what was done, drawn chiefly from the Bishop's summary. The question of the Communion Office was not discussed, nor that of Metropolitan; but the Primus was declared to have the title 'Most Reverend.' The 'General' Synod became 'Provincial,' but, unhappily, no rule was passed regulating its periodical convocation, although the Bishops had proposed that it should meet every five years. In Canon i. reference is made to the joining of Priests in laying on of hands on other Priests. In Canon ii. the title of the Primus is to be 'The Most Reverend the Bishop of —, Primus of the Scottish Church'—an expression said to be equivalent to 'the Episcopal Church in Scotland.' In Canon viii. Visitations are ordered, and a Bishop's power to minister

and do everything belonging to the Pastoral Office in every church within his jurisdiction is made clear. Canon ix., as we have seen, recognises 'Cathedral Churches,' but provides that they must have a proper endowment. In Canon xix. the services of laymen as preachers are permitted to be used with the Bishop's license. It may be remarked that in these canons generally 'Incumbent' is changed to 'Rector.' In Canon xxx. the presence of adult communicants of either sex at 'Diocesan Synods' is provided for, males being permitted to speak, and notice of such Synods is made obligatory; but nothing was done here, or in Canon xxxii. ('Provincial Synods'), to give laymen a right to vote. Canon xxxviii., on 'Holy Baptism,' is not very clear, but seems more favourable to what may be called the liberal view of the validity of lay Baptism than the canon previously in force. Canon xl., 'Of Confirmation,' sanctions the prefix of the form 'N. I sign thee with the sign of the Cross and lay my hand upon thee' wherever the Bishop, 'with the concurrence of the clergyman,' shall think fit to introduce it. In Canon xli., 'Of Holy Matrimony,' it is ordered that all marriages, in ordinary cases, shall take place in church; but the clergy may, at their discretion, omit a part of the prefatory and of the concluding address. As regards the interpretation of the canons, it was declared that 'the canons shall be construed in accordance with the principles of the civil law of Scotland,' with an appeal, if necessary, to any generally recognised principles of Canon Law.

At the end of the year 1890, on Christmas Day, the Bishop caught a chill, which was followed by a severe illness which brought his life into danger. His weakness continued for the next half-year, during which his Episcopal duties were taken by his colleagues of Glasgow and Edinburgh, particularly the former. In the autumn he gradually regained

strength, and on Thursday, 1 October, 1891, he took part with Lord Lothian and Mr. Gladstone and others in the Jubilee of Trinity College, Glenalmond. A newspaper account of the proceedings¹ describes the Bishop's speech as 'far and away the best, and delivered with an eloquence that left Mr. Gladstone's far behind. . . . The words came away in strong and silvery tones, and without much effort. Every sentence was modulated with the skill of an accomplished orator; and when he ceased it was, as Longfellow says of the passing of Evangeline, the ceasing of beautiful music.' He had prepared a longer address, which was printed in the 'Scottish Guardian' (16 October).

On the same day (1 October) the first volume of his 'Annals' was published, and on the 21st of the same month he received a letter from the publishers saying that a second edition was called for—one of the best of 'tonics' to a literary man.

The Bishop was permitted to deliver in person one more Charge, and that one of his best, on 'Modern Teaching on the Canon of the Old Testament,' at Perth, a few days after the Glenalmond Jubilee (on 7 October). Of this Canon Farquhar wrote in his Journal:—

We had our Diocesan Synod at the west end of the Cathedral. Since the Dean had installed the Archdeacon as a Canon [which he had previously scrupled about doing] there was no business except the Bishop's Charge. He is a wonderful old man. I never expected to hear him deliver another Charge. It was on Old Testament criticism, and a very learned and helpful address he gave. . . . Is this the end of his great series of Charges? He has published his Annals volume I.

This Charge was printed at the end of the volume 'Primary Witness to the Truth of the Gospel,' published

¹ *Perthshire Advertiser*.

early in the last year of his life (1892). It is remarkably vigorous, and struck out rather a new line of study on his part, showing the great freshness of his interest in questions of the day. It is characteristic of the two brothers that both their last publications were on the Old Testament; but, while my father's was intended for edification ('How to Read the Old Testament,' addressed to his grandchildren), my uncle's was controversial, though controversial with the mellow wisdom of age and the confidence of long experience of God's Providence over His written Word. The most original argument is that drawn from the analogy of the fate of Wolf's theory of Homer, in which I cannot but think it a happy thing that he returned to sympathy with his old friend Mr. Gladstone, from whom, as a politician, he had long been alienated. He quotes largely from him as to the *reaction* against the theory of the late date of the Homeric poems, which Wolf supposed did not exist in their present form till the time of Pisistratus, four or five centuries after the date usually assigned to Homer, and which he also attributed to a number of unknown writers called Rhapsodists. The Bishop aptly compares Wolf's 'Prolegomena ad Homerum' with Wellhausen's 'Prolegomena to the History of Israel,' and draws an inference that the speculations of the latter are likely to meet with the same fate as those of the former. He ends this part of his argument as follows:—

Upon the whole this at least may be fairly said: the collapse of the Wolfian theory in its attempt to dethrone Homer, notwithstanding the energy with which it was prosecuted, and the triumphant air which it assumed, may well teach us to be doubly cautious how we meet the advances of the new criticism in its attempt to dethrone Moses, however we may admire the ability, or may be staggered by the boldness and assurance it displays. I say 'to be doubly cautious how we meet.' *We must not refuse to meet them.* On the contrary we must welcome every honest

inquiry which promises to throw light upon subjects of such deep interest, and at the same time of such great difficulty and obscurity.

He then goes on to do justice to the general beliefs and motives of the 'main supporters of the new doctrine,' particularly Canon Driver, ending as follows :

May we all strive to live, and to induce others to live, in obedience to the Holy Faith once for all delivered to the Saints ; and then, though we may fail to attain to the exact truth of which we are in search upon points such as those to which your attention has been directed, we may rest assured that our errors will be pardoned through the merits of the Saviour whom God has mercifully revealed to us in His inspired Word.

On Easter Eve, 16 April 1892, he received a present from the members of the Church in St. Andrews, which gratified him not a little from the manner in which it was given. The following was the address and the reply which he made to it :

To the Right Rev. Charles Wordsworth, D.C.L. Oxon., D.D. St. Andrews and Edinburgh, Bishop of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane,—Right Reverend Sir,—The congregation of St. Andrews Church desire to present you, in the 40th year of your Episcopate, with the Episcopal chair and pastoral staff which accompany this address. We offer them as a slight evidence of the reverence and affection we cherish towards you, not only as our Bishop, but also as our friend. In doing so we rejoice to know how much you are esteemed throughout the Diocese over which you rule, as well as by those in Churches different from our own who are acquainted with your character, your writings, and your long career of public usefulness. We pray that your life may be prolonged in order that by wise and just counsel you may help to remove misunderstandings which divide the Christian world and promote the spiritual union of all good men, however widely they may be separated in other matters. The chair and staff are made from oak, given for the purpose by the Very Rev. H. G. Liddell, D.D., the late Dean of Christ Church, Oxford ;

and we trust that you will allow them to remain within St. Andrews Church, in which we have so often listened to your words and have been cheered by your presence. They will be a permanent memorial of your honoured name.

The Bishop, in reply, said,—My dear friends and brethren in Christ, I am greatly gratified and cheered under a trial of much bodily pain and infirmity by the regard and affection which you have exhibited towards me in this address. I also rejoice to think that through your kindness and generosity to me my successors in the Episcopate to the end of time will be provided with an official chair and a pastoral staff, which, through the excellence of their workmanship, are not unworthy of the sacred place and solemn purpose for which they are designed. You have alluded to the source from which the material they are composed of has been obtained. The fact you mention cannot fail to give them an historical interest, and to me especially, as a Christ Church man and a friend of the late Dean, it enhances their value. You have also reminded me that this is the 40th year since I became your Bishop; and you are so good as to express a hope that my life, which has been so mercifully prolonged when so many of my juniors have been called away, may still be preserved for some time to come. In such circumstances an occasion like this is one for deep feeling and much serious reflection on my part rather than for many words. I will, therefore, only say further that I appreciate these tokens of your esteem and attachment very highly, and thank you one and all for them most heartily.

The *Te Deum* was then sung, and the ceremony closed with the Benediction.

But even this was not the Bishop's last public utterance. Though suffering in these last years from severe pain and bodily weakness, his intellectual vigour was still great, and to within a few weeks of his death he was making progress with the second volume of his 'Annals,' and preparing the material which has been used in this memoir. He also published a valuable volume of sermons ('Primary Witness to the Truth of the Gospel') and revised his book on Shakespeare and the 'Outlines of the Christian Ministry.'

On 12 August, 1892, he wrote from Edinburgh to Miss M. Barter :

Since I came here I have written my Charge (not long), but have made as yet very little progress with the 'Annals'—proof sheets are coming in both of 'Shakespeare' and 'Outlines,' so that I do not expect to be ready for your kindly-offered and valuable assistance so soon as I had hoped [probably in copying the 'Annals'], probably not till the end of the year or thereabouts.

The Charge was delivered in the Bishop's absence on 5 October.¹ Canon Farquhar writes in his Diary :

We have to-day what may most likely prove to be Bishop Wordsworth's last Diocesan Synod. Last night we were awakened by terrific peals of thunder, and all to-day rain has been descending in torrents. Nevertheless there was a fair attendance of clergy and laity. The Bishop himself was absent for the first time during an Episcopate of 40 years! His Charge was read by the Dean. The old man's appeal to the Presbyterians ('for the last time') was very touching. . . . The Archdeacon, in happy terms, proposed a motion congratulating the Bishop on his undiminished intellectual energy, and conveying the affectionate thanks of the Synod for some touching words of farewell with which the Charge concluded. This was carried unanimously. And is this indeed the end of these forty years of mighty Charges?

The following statistics for two years, 1853 and 1892, giving the figures at the beginning and the end of his

¹ It was printed in full in the *Scottish Guardian* of 7 October, where it occupies nearly nine closely printed columns. It is therefore of considerable length, and is of the author's accustomed ability. Its text is the address of Dr. Charteris as Moderator of the General Assembly: 'The Sacred Foundation of the Church of Scotland.' The Bishop restates the two main features of his scheme, (1) that he did not mean it to apply to Non-conformity in general, but to Scottish Presbyterianism; (2) that the acceptance, where desired, of Presbyterian ordination, was not to be as a rule for the future, but *pro hac vice*. He notices an article in the *Church Times* of 23 September supporting a 'precisely similar' view.

Episcopate, will show at a glance something of the progress made in forty years, though they only represent a few heads of work. I borrow them mainly from Canon Farquhar's 'History' (p. 412) :

	Incumbencies	Souls	Communicants	Confirmed	Baptised	Parsonages
1853 .	16	2,552	1,132	122	91	2 ¹
1892 .	26 ²	6,665	3,283	1,528 ³	208	20
Increase	10	4,113	2,151	1,406	117	18

And now the Bishop, having rendered up his accounts to man, might have hoped that he would be left in peace to prepare to give account of his stewardship to Him who gave it. But the end of strife was not yet. Most untowardly the meeting of the Glasgow Church Conference, not a week after the delivery of the Charge, gave an opening to a trusted officer of the Diocese to criticise the Bishop's Reunion policy in a manner which the critic himself afterwards deeply regretted. This was on 11 October. It was apparently in consequence of this that the Bishop once again took pen in hand, and in a very vigorous and lucid letter addressed to the 'Scotsman' on the 13th (which appeared in its issue of the 15th⁴) made what he described as an *Apologia pro vita sua*. There was no reference to the untoward incident, but after an allusion to the failure of prophecies about his uncle (like Jeffrey's famous 'This will never do' on the 'Excursion'), he went on to put a series of thirteen questions, the answers to which must (in his opinion) necessarily be in the affirmative, and all tend to support his position. Some kind of an apology

¹ These were Dunblane and Kirriemuir.

² Add also 18 Missions, Private Chapels, &c.

³ The number confirmed is very large by comparison. It must imply that a great many Presbyterians received the rite. The boys of the training ship 'Mars' must also be counted.

⁴ It was reprinted in the *Scottish Guardian* of the 28th.

was made by his critic in a letter to the 'Scottish Guardian,' but it did not quite satisfy his devotion to the cause—for though wounded in person he clearly felt for *that* far the most. Yet he fretted much under the unlooked for charge, made by one whom he loved, that he had not only been doing no good, but had done positive harm, and he could not wholly pass it over. The result was a final and a very remarkable exertion, made within a fortnight of his death, in the form of a letter to the same Church newspaper, entitled 'An Attempt to remove Misunderstanding,' dated 21 November, and appearing in its issue of the 25th. The arguments are well marshalled and the points made clear, and, while he lost nothing in point of dignity, his cause was certainly the gainer. The critic was gently but firmly answered, and those concerned reminded of the necessity of historical studies and full consideration of circumstances, before expressing an opinion on the great cause to which he had given the best part of his life.

In the interval between these two letters he noticed with thankfulness a hopeful incident in another quarter.

This was the foundation of the Scottish Church Society, which was constituted at a meeting held in Edinburgh on 19 October, under the presidency of his friend, Dr. Milligan (see the report in the 'Scottish Guardian,' 28 October, p. 576). The following words stand at the head of its constitution :

The motto of the Society shall be *Ask for the Old Paths . . . and walk therein.*

The general purpose of the Society shall be to defend and advance Catholic doctrine as set forth in the Ancient Creeds and embodied in the standards of the Church of Scotland, and generally to assert Scriptural principles in all matters relating to Church Order and Policy, Christian work and Spiritual life throughout Scotland.

Here was clearly the beginning of a 'Tractarian movement' inside the Established Church, which might well be expected to have as important fruits as that which had coincided with the Bishop's early days, and thus a gleam of light shone across his last month of life.

The following account of the last days of the Bishop has been written by a member of the family :

Early in December he was taken ill ; the illness, though painful, was mercifully short, and it was plain that the long life was close to its end. Friday, only four days before his death, he was evidently aware of this ; severe pain coming on, he remarked that this was certainly to be 'his cross.' He was full of tender consideration for the daughter who was his chief companion and nurse during that last week, anxious that she should not be knocked up, and saying, as he kissed her that Friday evening, 'My dear, you *have* been good to me !' His mind was vigorous almost to the last ; and, still intent on the Church and Diocese he loved so well, on Sunday afternoon he dictated for the post directions concerning the induction of an Incumbent and other ecclesiastical business. On Monday, the last day, he received with thankfulness the loving ministry of a young priest then in charge at St. Andrews. About 10 o'clock in the morning, feeling his powers failing, he raised himself in bed with a strong and concentrated effort and, with a clear and vigorous voice, offered his last prayer and act of humble contrition, in which he earnestly described himself as 'the chiefest of sinners.' He only spoke once again, when, seeing another daughter, who had come from a distance to his death-bed, he said with a loving smile to her, 'Are you there, my dear ? Oh, I am so glad to see you.' His face brightened again as his children said the 'Te Deum' and, as the evening drew on, sang hymns round his bed—till about 8 p.m. on 5 December his spirit passed painlessly away.

He was buried in the Cathedral cemetery on Friday, the 9th. His body was taken into the chancel of St. Andrew's Church the previous evening, and watched through the night by members of the congregation. Early in the morning, while a golden sunrise lit up sea and sky with a radiant glow quite remarkable for that cold, foggy December season, a congregation of loving

mourners—his own family and others—gathered for the celebration of the Holy Communion. Later on, the church was filled for the last offices, and, by special permission of the city authorities, the ancient west doorway of the ruined Cathedral—long since disused—was opened to receive the funeral procession of, in all probability, the first bishop who had been buried there since the Reformation.¹

The Primus (Brechin) and the Bishops of Edinburgh and Glasgow attended the service, and the Bishop of Edinburgh committed the body to the ground.

The following extract from a letter of his son Robert describes the circumstances of that funeral service :

Nothing could have exceeded the beauty and the brightness of his funeral. There was a cloudless sky—the sun shining in all its glory, and just a sprinkling of fresh snow. As the long procession—composed of all classes and creeds uniting to do honour to his memory—passed under the grand old western doorway of the Cathedral and wound its way up the roofless nave, following the surpliced choir, and clergy, bishops, and mourners—surely if there are windows in Paradise (as my father said of Bishop Hamilton in his sermon on Daniel), he must have been allowed to gaze on that scene in rapturous joy. Oh, how his soul would delight in it! To no one who took part could the thought have been absent that the work of his life was already bearing fruit, and in God's good time would surely produce an hundredfold.

On the coffin we placed two lovely crosses of flowers, one at the head from 'Glenalmond' (how pleased he would have been to know that their tribute of affection was on his head), the other from my sisters, below the plate which bore his name. He has left, I am thankful to say, the inscription for the marble slab which is to be placed in the wall over his grave. He lies just below one of the old walls of the Cathedral churchyard.

The epitaph now in place, almost as he wrote it, is as follows (see 'Scottish Guardian,' 17 November 1893) :

¹ As far as can be gathered from the History of St. Andrews, the last Prelate was a Stewart, cousin of Mary Queen of Scots, who was interred in front of the High Altar.

In memory of
 The Right Rev. CHARLES WORDSWORTH, D.D. and D.C.L.,
 for forty years
 Bishop of the United Diocese
 of St. Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane.
 Born at Lambeth 22nd August, 1806.
 Died at St. Andrews 5th December, 1892.
 Aged 86.

Remembering the prayer of his Divine Lord and Master
 for the unity of His Church on earth,
 He prayed continually and laboured earnestly
 that a way may be found, in God's good time,
 For the reunion of the Episcopal and Presbyterian bodies
 Without the sacrifice of Catholic principle
 or Scriptural Truth.

On the curb enclosing the grave are the following words :
 'Carolus Wordsworth, 1806-1892' at the head; 'S^ci
 Andreae Episcopus, 1853-1892' at the foot'; 'Manus ad
 clavum + Oculus ad coelum' on the right; 'Veritas in
 Caritate + Unitas in Veritate' on the left (cp. p. 20 *n.*)

The following, from an unpublished Lecture by Dr.
 Danson, may come in fitly here.

1. He found the Church on his arrival in Scotland obscure in position and submissively apologetic in demeanour. He could not materially increase her numbers or add to her wealth. But he could and did employ his great powers in bringing her from the shades of obscurity into a position which challenged the attention of the public mind. Nothing can be more striking than the contrast between the line of Dr. James Walker's sermon preached at the consecration of Bishop Sandford and the bold and aggressive vindication of the Episcopal Church in Scotland assumed by Charles Wordsworth even in his earliest days of high office in the Church. The controversy which had all but slept since the days of the great antagonists Principal George Campbell and Bishop John Skinner, upon the true nature of an Apostolic ministry, was re-opened with vigour, courtesy, and learning. With a laity so deeply interested in Ecclesiastical

questions as is the population of Scotland, Church leaders and Professors of Theology in the different Christian communities could not afford to be silent. His intensified and persistent appeal could neither be despised nor ignored. Accordingly answers of varying merit were given, formally in Church courts, or sporadically in pamphlets or in the press, only to meet with replies which had (not for their least merit) the marks of unflinching courtesy and an honest desire to understand, on the part of the Bishop, his adversary's position.

2. By his own prowess as a scholar and teacher, by his personal munificence in the cause of higher education, and by the labours of the brilliant band of colleagues attracted by his enthusiasm, he made it possible for the upper classes of Scotland to obtain in their own country an education for their sons which before his day could only be had at the historic schools of England. The gain was manifold.

3. By his personal learning, the pursuit of which was ever bringing new accessions to his stores, he illustrated the glory of a learned ministry—not, I may say, of a learning which employs and exhausts itself in curious annotations of old-world compositions, but of offering upon the altar of God the spoils he had captured from the great minds of Paganism. His classic muse even Keble did not disdain to employ upon occasion.

4. By steeping his spirit in the great Anglican divines, especially of the Caroline period—men whose width and depth of reading and height of mental gifts he was well qualified to gauge—he preserved the robust qualities especially characteristic of Anglican theology, free from the accretions either of Geneva or Rome.

And above all, he recalled the Christian thought of Scotland to the sinfulness of schism and to the manifold ill effects of unnecessary disunion. To patriotism, to motives even of financial prudence, to social instincts, he directed more subdued appeals. His trumpet notes, however, proclaimed to every mountain and glen in the land that as in high heaven so also here on earth the Kingdom of Christ is one kingdom, that, even for her, union is strength; that it is wrong ideally and foolish practically for the servants of the one King to distract her with factious watchwords and self-devised modes of government; that the time had now come when the most chivalrous, the most patriotic and the

wisest and best on both sides might concert measures of internal peace to make her external warfare more effective, and so to gladden the heart of her King. When unity had been restored within her walls, then and then only would the poet's words have any real significance.

‘ Blow trumpet ! He will lift us from the dust.
 Blow trumpet ! Live the strength and die the lust.
 Clang battle-axe and clash brand ! Let the King reign.
 Blow ! for our Sun is mighty in His way.
 Blow ! for our Sun is mightier day by day ! ’

The Bishop of Glasgow spoke eloquently in the same strain in his Charge of 1893 (‘ Scottish Guardian,’ 17 November), and Canon Farquhar, who published a fine memorial sermon on his Bishop, writes this deliberate estimate :

Although strong men and strong theologians, such as Bishop Rattray, contemplative saints like Bishop Jolly, able administrators like Bishop John Skinner, powerful intellects like Bishop Gleig, hardworking theological saints like Bishop Alexander Forbes, have held the Episcopate in Scotland since its disestablishment in 1689, it may well be doubted whether Bishop Charles Wordsworth does not stand out pre-eminent amongst them for a certain largeness of personality ; and it is certain that he surpassed them all in the way in which his utterances commanded the ear of the Scottish public (‘ H. of Perth,’ p. 413).

As regards his supposed egotism in reference to the questions on which he spoke and wrote so much, Mr. Farquhar has some excellent remarks in his MS. Diary, which I am glad to have his leave to quote rather than to attempt a vindication of my uncle in my own words. The note (which belongs to October 1887) also contains a statement as to the attitude of leading Presbyterians, which I believe to be well founded. It exactly represents the Bishop's mind and belief on the subject, which, as has been said, never changed.

The Bishop impresses me in private, as in public, as being a most powerful man; and moreover in private that egotism, which I have sometimes heard objected to him, disappears. When you talk to him in the freedom of private conversation, and so put away your own egotism as to interest yourself in his ideas and schemes, all his references to 'my movement,' 'the letters I have received from leading Presbyterian Ministers,' &c., &c., which to those who are devoid of the power of sympathy seem rather egotistical, are soon discovered to issue from the old man's way of losing his own personality in *that* (so to speak) of his schemes. Particularly is this the case with his movement for the reconciliation of Presbyterians with Episcopalians. When he speaks about himself in this connection he merges his individuality in that of his great idea. 'My Charge' is then only the latest development of the 'Cause,' and 'the flattering terms in which I was spoken of' is only a gleam of sunshine which has fallen upon *it*. What he said to me this morning about his great scheme was as follows: 'Every one believes that I am deceived by the undoubted encouragements which I receive in private letters from the leading Presbyterian Ministers in the country. No doubt, though they write like this to *me*, they take up an almost hostile attitude *in public*. But then I maintain that they are not altogether free agents in public. As ministers they were obliged to take an oath that they would do nothing to forward Episcopacy either directly or indirectly. And consequently in their public capacity they feel compelled in common honesty to do what they can to uphold the requirements of their official position. And besides, except from myself, they get no encouragement from us to show their real feelings. But I have written evidence to prove that the leaders of Presbyterianism in this country are in their hearts more or less dissatisfied with Presbyterianism, and more or less prepared to welcome Episcopacy, if Episcopacy would not take up a *non possumus* attitude towards them. . . .¹

'Therefore my object is (said the Bishop), amidst the evident unsettlement of mind, which is next to universal among the leaders of Presbyterianism in this country—seeing that they are all moving away in some manner from their ancient moorings—

¹ I omit the names here given, some of them those of living men.

to try and turn the tide in the right direction.' And he concluded by regretting that so many leading Churchmen did not appear awake to the fact that now 'there was a tide in the affairs of men, which taken at the flood might lead on to fortune.' I ventured to say that I thought what frightened some of us in his Lordship's scheme, large and generous as it was, lay in his apparent assertion of the non-necessity of the re-ordination of Presbyterian Ministers. 'Well,' he said, 'I am aware of it, and no doubt things would be in an irregular condition for a generation. But during that time those who did not recognise the validity of Presbyterian Ordination would not be forced to recognise it; they could, as now, resort to the ministrations of the properly ordained clergy, and as every fresh ordination would be Episcopal, the abnormal state of things would gradually pass away. In 1662 this was the course formally adopted by the Scottish Episcopate. The Presbyterian Ministers were left in possession of their parishes without re-ordination, and if doing this once has not unchurched us, doing it twice would not.'

I will conclude this chapter with an extract from a sermon preached in the East Parish Church, Aberdeen, by Dr. James Cooper, which may serve as a specimen of what Presbyterians of the most liberal and advanced type of Churchmanship were not afraid to say about his work.

Dr. Cooper reminded his congregation of the forty-six years of service to the cause of Christian Unity which the Bishop gave, and then thus proceeded :

In 1846 he came to Scotland animated with the high aim—to which he dedicated all his after-life—of healing the breach which since 1661 had separated Presbyterians and Episcopalians. The aim was noble, Christian, and, in the best sense, patriotic. It was surely not impracticable. Men—Scotsmen—who preferred Presbytery managed in the first half of the seventeenth century to live together in one unbroken Reformed Church. And even had there never been agreement in the past, is there never to be any in the future? 'Surely,' to quote a saying of the late Principal Campbell, to which Bishop Wordsworth very frequently referred, 'surely the visible Church is not to remain always in

its present divided condition.' The prayer of our Lord will one day be fulfilled—'That they all may be one . . . that the world may believe.' To my thinking, Bishop Wordsworth's aim was the noblest to which any Churchman in our modern Scotland could devote himself; and certainly he pursued it in no unworthy spirit—with no selfish or sectarian ends, with unfailing courtesy, with rare candour and wonderful perseverance—through good report and bad report; with unswerving singleness of heart; with hope undying because it rested on the word of Christ and trusted in the power of the Holy Ghost.

CHAPTER VIII

EVENING OF LIFE, PARTICULARLY AT ST. ANDREWS (1876-1892)

‘Inveni portum! Spes et Fortuna, valete!
Sat me lusistis, ludite nunc alios.’

‘Immo alii inveniant ego quem, Christo auspice, portum,
Spes ubi non fallax Forsque perennis adest.’

1. *Latin verses: partnership with Dean Stanley.*

Motto of this chapter: its history—Stanley’s version—Lines addressed to Dean Ramsay (1872)—Lines to Lord Beaconsfield on his return from Berlin Congress (1878)—His acknowledgment—‘Beaumont & Fletcher’—Stanley’s valediction.

2. *Latin verses connected principally with St. Andrews.*

Sophocles loquitur—Prof. Lewis Campbell’s reply—Lines on Campbell’s recovery from bronchitis—Lines to the ‘Country Parson’—Elegy on Principal Tulloch (1886)—Intercourse with Principal Shairp and Prof. Knight—St. Leonard’s Girls’ School—Agnata Ramsay’s success (1887)—The ‘Scarlet Gown’ (1878)—Dr. Macgregor’s salmon—Dean Johnston’s ‘Wide-awake.’

3. *The Wykehamist Dinner of 1880 and Athletics.*

Speeches at Wykehamist dinner—First game of golf (1890)—‘Pindar and Athletics, Ancient and Modern’ (1888)—Letter on skating—The ‘Flying Mercury.’

4. *Revival or continuation of old friendships—Literary correspondence.*

Cardinal Manning—Merivale’s anecdote—Cardinal Newman—The Bishop’s judgment of him—Opinion on Archbishop Trench—Letters to Dean Boyle—On Baxter—On Clarendon—On Hooker, Plea for Justice, &c.—Extract from Canon Farquhar’s Diary: The Bishop’s orderliness—The two Skinners—Letter to Dean Merivale: lines from Statius—The Bishop’s version and the Dean’s—Mr. Tuckwell’s ‘Tongues in Trees’—Mr. Gladstone: note to Sir J. E. Eardley-Wilmot—Intercourse with Bishop Cloughton—Bishop Moberly’s golden wedding—Interest in his nephews’ writings.



Bishop of St. Andrews
from a Photograph taken in 1850

1850

5. *Last publications in verse and prose executed and projected.*

Latin poem on 'Night-mare'—'Series Collectarum,' &c.—Other Hymns—'Lead, kindly Light'—Sonnet by Bishop of Ripon after visit to St. Andrews—Volumes of Sermons, Lectures, and Reviews, projected.

6. *Manner of Preaching and Confirming.*

Impressiveness of his sermons—Dr. Danson's criticism—Always uses manuscript—Manner of confirming—Order of service—Cards.

7. *Lord Selborne's Character of Bishop Wordsworth.*

The Bishop's remarks upon the book and the character.

8. *Conclusion.*1. *Latin verses: partnership with Dean Stanley*

The lines which form the motto of this chapter were designed by the Bishop as an inscription to be placed on the wall of a summer house at Bishopshall, overlooking the harbour. They consist of a somewhat cynical distich translated from the Greek Anthology,¹ which has found much favour as a monumental inscription in various countries of Europe, including our own, and two lines of a generous Christian character written by the Bishop to express his own thankfulness for the blessings of eternal life, especially in his declining years, and the hope that others might share them. He repeated the lines, in March 1877, to Dean Stanley, when he came to St. Andrews to deliver an address to the students, and suggested to him that he should turn them into English, as he had some years before felicitously turned some lines addressed to Dean Ramsay. Stanley two days later enclosed the following version :

Hail, happy Haven! By this tranquil shore
 From life's long storms I find an easy port ;
 False Hope and fickle Fortune, now no more
 My course beguile: let others be your sport !

¹ See Jacobs' *Anthologia*, ii. 20, 49 :

Ἐλπίς καὶ σὺ Τύχη μέγα χαίρετε τὸν λιμέν' εὖρον.
 Οὐδὲν ἔμοι χ' ὑμῖν παίζετε τοὺς μετ' ἐμέ.

Hail, happier Haven still ! May others, too,
 Led by their Lord, find here what I have found ;
 With Hope more sure than earth's vain fancies knew,
 With brighter Bliss than this world's fortune crowned.

Other friends, including Dean Liddell, Bishop Moberly, and Professor Lewis Campbell tried their hands at the rendering of the whole or part of the lines, and the Bishop preserved a number of notes on the first epigram. From these I gather that the Latin version is by 'Janus Pannonius, a Hungarian Bishop, who died in 1474,' and that its most correct form is :

Inveni portum : Spes et Fortuna valete,
 Nil mihi vobiscum : ludite nunc alios.

Lily, the grammarian, and Sir Thomas More amongst ourselves also adopted or adapted it. One correspondent (Archdeacon Hessey) notices that the epitaph on Archbishop Laud in St. John's College Chapel, Oxford, is based upon it :

Qui fui in extremis fortunam expertus utramque,
 Nemo magis felix et mage nemo miser,
 Iam portum inveni. Spes et Fortuna valete,
 Ludite nunc alios, pax erit alta mihi.

Le Sage makes his hero 'Gil Blas' set up the Latin distich over his home in Valencia, and Lord Brougham is actually said to have done so over the door of his villa at Cannes. It occurs as an epitaph at Barsham Church, Suffolk, and curiously enough on a fine Jacobean tomb belonging to the Warham family, in Osmington Church, Dorset, close to which I write this Chapter ; and it probably would be found in not a few other places. Burton, in his 'Anatomy of Melancholy' (2, 3, 6), wrongly ascribes the lines to Prudentius. His version of them is, however, very good (rendering 'Nil mihi vobiscum') :

Mine haven's found, fortune and hope adieu.
Mock others now, for I have done with you.

Of those sent to my uncle, Bishop Moberly's seems to me the best :

Port won ! to luck and hope I make my bow.
Me you have mocked enough, mock others now.

The friendship with Dean Stanley, of which these lines are an instance, was one of the many pleasanter features of the Bishop's later life. Stanley was, it need scarcely be said, when he was at his ease, one of the most charming of companions, giving something of himself and of his best self in a few moments, and compressing the experiences that he was relating into words that gave you a subtle flavour of his own feeling. I remember his describing his night spent in the Kremlin of Moscow in a way that made me feel for the time that I had been with him ; and again, his saying about the last volume of his Jewish history, in a deep tone that made you realise his faith in another life, ' I have tried to do justice to Judas Maccabeus. I hope he will thank me for it some day.' The association between him and my uncle in such compositions may be illustrated by several other graceful fugitive pieces, particularly the lines addressed to Dean Ramsay and to Lord Beaconsfield. The lines to the former belong to an earlier year (12 August, 1872), and were prefaced by the following characteristic note—for my uncle fled to the Latin Muses whenever he was incapacitated by headache for other work :¹

My dear Dean,—Your kind, welcome, and most elegant present [the 20th edition of 'Reminiscences of Scottish Life and Cha-

¹ In one of his pocket-books he sets down the following pretty lines by Cyril Jackson, which have, however, one failing—that the last, which ought to give the point, is not *exactly* right, unless the author meant to insist

acter'] reached me yesterday—in bed; to which and to my sofa I have been confined for some days by a severe attack of brow ague. And being thus disabled for more serious employment I allowed my thoughts to run upon the lines which you will find overleaf. Please to accept them as being *well intended*; though (like many other good intentions) I am afraid they give only too true evidence of the source from which they come, viz. a *disordered head*.

The lines may be followed at once by Stanley's translation, though that was not written till later.

Ad virum venerabilem, optimum, dilectissimum, Eduardum B. Ramsay, LL.D., Edinburgi Decanum, accepto ejus libro, cui titulus 'Reminiscences of Scottish Life and Character,' vicesimum jam lautiusque et amplius edito.

EDITIO accessit vicesima! plaudite, quicquid
 Scotia festivi fert lepidaque ferax!
 Non vixit frustrà, qui frontem utcunque severam
 Noverit innocuis explicuisse jocis:
 Non frustrà vixit, qui tot monumenta Priorum
 Salsa piâ vetuit sedulitate mori:
 Non frustrà vixit, qui, quali nos sit amore
 Vivendum, exemplo præcipiensque docet.
 Nec merces te indigna manet: Juvenesque senesque
 Gaudebunt nomen concelebrare tuum;
 Condiēt appositum dum fercula nostra salinum,
 Præbebitque suas mensa secunda nuces;
 Dum stantis rhedæ aurigam tua pagina fallēt,
 Contentum in sella tædia longa pati!

upon the fact that his chief experience in life was a superabundant sense of his own vitality:—

‘ Si mihi, si liceat producere leniter ævum,
 Nec pompam, nec opes, nec mihi regna petam;
 Vellem ut, divini pandens mysteria verbi,
 Vitam in secreto rure beatus agam.
 Adsint et Graiæ comites Latiaque Camenæ,
 Et lepida faveat conjuge laetus Hymen.
 Tum satis: aeternum spes, cura, dolorque valete
 Hoc tantum superest discere: posse mori!

Quid, quod et ipsa sibi devinctum Scotia nutrix
 Te perget gremio grata fovere senem ;
 Officiumque pium simili pietate rependens,
 Sæcula nulla sinet non¹ meminisse Tui.

A Translation of the foregoing in Verse

BY THE VERY REV. ARTHUR P. STANLEY, D.D., DEAN OF WESTMINSTER.

HAIL twentieth edition ! from Orkney to Tweed
 Let the wits of all Scotland come running to read.
 Not in vain hath he lived who by innocent mirth
 Hath lightened the frowns and the furrows of earth ;
 Not in vain hath he *lived* who will never let *die*
 The humours of good times for ever gone by ;
 Not in vain hath he lived who hath laboured to give
 In himself the best proof how by LOVE we may live.
 Rejoice, my dear Dean, thy reward to behold,
 In united rejoicing of young and of old ;
 Remembered so long as our board shall not lack
 A bright grain of salt or a hard nut to crack ;
 So long as the cabman, aloft in his seat,
 Broods deep o'er thy page as he waits in the street.
 Yea, Scotland herself, with affectionate care,
 Shall nurse an old age so beloved and so rare,
 And still gratefully seek in her heart to enshrine
 One more *Reminiscence*, and that shall be thine.

The lines to Lord Beaconsfield belong to 1878, when he returned from the Berlin Congress bringing 'Peace with Honour.'

*Ad Virum Nobilissimum Comitem de Beaconsfield, A. P. Eq.,
 &c., &c.*

Post reditum a Berolinensi Congressu, Jul. 16, 1878.

SALVE iterum nobis, Vir præstantissime, salve,
 Cujus 'Pax' sequitur, 'non sine Honore,' pedes !
 Te populus reducem, te Patria grata salutat ;
 Te mare, rura, urbes ; Te Thamesisque Pater.

¹ Alluditur ad titulum libri *Reminiscences*, &c.

Non capiti galea est ; non ensem extenta coruscant
 Dextera ; per plateas non tuba rauca sonat :
 Milite pro stipante vias, en ! fœmina jactat
 Serta, novisque micat floribus omne solum !
 Nam tu progredieris Victor potiore triumpho
 Quam quos, effuso sanguine, Bella parant.
 Vox tibi pro gladio est ; tibi mens armata vigore,
 Injusti impatiens, propositique tenax :
 Nec minus ingenium quid possit ad omnia promptum,
 Quid possit patriæ non cohibendus amor,
 Europæ atque Asiæ nuper congressa Potestas,
 Consiliis, didicit, pacificata tuis.
 Hinc est quod tibi partus honos, plaudente Senatu,
 Dum grave certamen lingua diserta refert ;
 Hinc est quod, Populi Reginâ interprete vocum,
 Stella, velut cælo, pectore fixa micat ;
 Vidimus et lætos plena inter pocula cives
 Certatim nomen concelebrare tuum.
 Tu vero interea longe ulteriora revolvens,
 Concipis indignum nil ¹ humilive modo :—
 ‘ Scilicet effugiant alii discrimina ² rerum,
 Si quos, officium quò vocat, ire piget ;
 Sit virtus aliis in præsens, et sibi solis
 Per tritas tutò consuluisse vias ;—
 Anglia, majus opus tibi contigit ; area major
 Gentibus et potior, te præeunte, patet :
 Laus tua sit petiisse humanum quicquid ubique
 Provehat in melius, nobilitetque, genus.
 Nec faustum omen abest ; tibi serviet Insula posthac
 Sedem ubi dilectam condidit alma Venus,
 Æneadum ³ genetrix, qui legibus, artibus, armis,
 Latè hominum mores excoluere feros.
 At tibi nobilior Romanâ nata propago
 Jamdudum didicit nobiliora sequi.
 Jus tibi, Libertas, tibi Copia rite ministrat,
 Et Christi e cælo tradita pura Fides.

¹ ‘ Nil parvum, aut *humili modo*,
 Nil mortale loquar.’—Hor. *Od.*

² ‘ Per varios casus, per tot *discrimina rerum.*’—Virg. *Æn.*

³ ‘ Æneadum genetrix . . . Alma Venus.’—Lucret. *sub inît.*

Aucta igitur Virtute, novo te accinge labori,
 Per mare, per terras, quò tua Fata vocant.
 Auspice Te, tellus Asiana, excussa veterno,
 Incipiat priscum jam renovare decus.
 Instar Apostolici ¹ miseris solatia praebe
 (Tu quoque solamen praesidiumque) viri;
 Mœniaque hinc Urbis spectans propiora sacratæ,
 Inde petas sanctas spes, Animumque ² Dei;
 Dum Sol Eoas, Lunâ ³ fugiente, per oras
 Nuntiat exoriens—Crux tibi summa salus! '

C. W.

To the Right Hon. the Earl of Beaconsfield, K.G., &c., &c., &c.

HAIL to the Chief who in triumph returns;
 'Peace,' but 'with honour,' his footsteps attends:
 Heart of Old England with gratitude burns;
 City with Country its welcoming blends.

Shines here no helmet, here glitters no sword;
 Trumpet sounds none in the long crowded street;
 Citizens only his cavalcade guard;
 Flowers from fair hands this new conqueror greet.

Brighter the hopes that his victories fill
 Than trophies won hard on the red battle-field;
 A sword in his voice, and a host in his will
 That daunts all aggression, and dares—not to yield.

Genius prepared both for faction and fighting;
 Patriot on fire for a land not his own;
 Eastern and Western in Congress uniting,
 Swayed by his counsel, their quarrels condone.

Hence rise the cheers of a Senate that listens
 To a tale yet more wondrous than that of 'Alroy';
 Hence on his bosom the Star that outglistens
 'Tancred's' wild vision and 'Coningsby's' joy.

¹ St. Barnabas.

² Vide 'Tancred,' *passim*.

³ The Crescent, Standard of Mahomet.

Banquet on banquet, and toast upon toast,
Fill up the measure of praise and of glory ;
Tell us, at last, without braggard or boast,
The moral of all this magnificent story.

Let others shun the hazards and the falls,
And shrink to climb the steep when Duty calls ;
Or, safe within the streak of silver sea,
Live for themselves and for the passing day.

England ! for thee a nobler task we find—
To lead the nations, not to lag behind ;
Be thine the praise, in every time and place,
To ennoble, kindle, purify our race !

Henceforth (blest omen !) thine the happy isle
On which the Queen of Love first deigned to smile ;
Mother of those whose laws, whose arms, whose arts
Subdued from clime to clime the wildest hearts.

But nobler than that old imperial Rome
Is to thy sons their own inspiring home ;
Wealth, Freedom, Justice, as thy dower are given,
And Gospel Truth, the last best boon of Heaven.

Then onwards to ' fresh woods and pastures new ;'
O'er earth and sea to thine own self be true ;
The ancient East, through thee with light divine
Once more imbued, shall still ' arise and shine.'

Like that ' good man,' the Cypriot saint of yore,
On friendless souls sweet consolations pour ;
Catch from the genius of the neighbouring strand
The holy stirrings of that Sacred Land ;
Whilst the bright Day-star sees the Crescent wane
Be thine this glorious Cross, not borne in vain !

Apology of the Translator to the Original.

What English verse can rival such Latinity,
 True classic child of Christ Church and of Trinity ?¹
 Yet still when Whig with Tory thus combines
 The glories of a Premier to rehearse,
 Mark how the *Whig's* untrammelled freedom shines
 Where'er he quits the *Tory's* glowing verse ;—
 And though hard bound within the Bishop's fetter,
 The Presbyterian prefers the spirit, not the letter.

A. P. STANLEY.

I do not know on which of these versions my uncle wrote the lines :—

Scripsi equidem carmen : tam bellè, tamque facetè
 Reddidit Interpres—desiit esse meum.

[I penned these lines indeed : but taste so fine
 Has giv'n them English—they're no longer mine.]

Lord Beaconsfield acknowledged the congratulations on 26 August, from Hughenden Manor, in the following characteristic note.

Dear Bishop of St. Andrews,—It is the happiest union since Beaumont and Fletcher.

I am deeply gratified by such an expression of sympathy from men so distinguished for their learning and genius.

Your faithful and obliged servant,

BEACONSFIELD.

Henceforth, in their correspondence, my uncle was 'Beaumont,' and Stanley, being a Bishop's son, was 'Fletcher,' though, as my uncle felt, the parallel between the union of two dramatists in one play was not exactly akin to their conjunction. The last communication from Stanley seems to be on a post-card (dated 30 December,

¹ Note by Chas. W.—I was of Christ Church, Oxford, but my father being Master of Trinity, my home was at Cambridge.

1880), in which he excuses himself from undertaking some similar brotherly task. But it breathes a very happy spirit of joyful friendliness. 'Divus Petrus' is of course the Church of St. Peter's, Westminster. The reader will notice that Stanley calls it his 'valediction.'

Senex seni venerando !
 Premor, heu ! luctu nefando :
 Mihi datur nullus locus
 Per, quod vocant, Hocus pocus,
 Versus Anglicè reddendi
 Et ad vulgus descendendi :
 Quia nitent sine fine
 Aequè Anglè et Latinè.
 In hâc valedictione,
 Docte, gravis, care, bone !
 Divus Petrus (rectè putat)
 Divum Andream salutat,
 Junctus illi semper grate
 Pari confraternitate.

I must at least attempt to do justice to such tender and pathetic playfulness.

Age to venerated age
 Needs must send the sad message :
 I've no longer at command
 Trick of verse or sleight of hand
 English to your lines to give,
 And in all men's mouths to live :
 For they're infinitely fine,
 Whether in English or Latine.
 Friend, who art learned, good and strong,
 And gentle, take my parting song !
 Let St. Peter thankfully
 To his Andrew bid goodb'ye,
 Ever happy to be joined
 With so brotherly a mind.

2. *Latin verses connected principally with St. Andrews.*

The Bishop also employed his Muse to convey his own kindly appreciation and sympathy to his friends and neighbours in the University of St. Andrews. The following lines to Professor Lewis Campbell, the editor and translator of Sophocles, were written indeed before he went to reside there, and enclosed in the letter which explains them from the Feu House, Perth, 30 December, 1875.

My dear Sir,—If I had not been more than commonly occupied since I received your favour of the 26th inst., it would have been acknowledged sooner, with due thanks—which I now beg to give—for your response to my ‘friendly and obliging challenge,’ and for the pleasure you have afforded me by letting me see the classical elegiacs which accompanied your letter. I have nothing to offer in return which is at all worthy of your acceptance: but Sophocles himself is so much gratified by the two-fold honour you have done him by your *ἐπαίνεσις*, and still more by your translation, that he has requested me to present to you the tribute of thanks which you will find on the next page.

Viro Revereudo Doctissimoque L. Campbell Græc. lit. in Acad. Sanct. Andr. Professore Sophocles olim Athen[iensis] nunc Elysius, Plurimos optans annos continuo faustiores S. P. D.

Qui me reddideris Graium sermone Britanno,
 Reddo equidem grates, docte poeta, tibi;
 Namque meam, fama est, Musam, te interprete, plausus
 Dum servat veteres elicuisse novos.

These lines may be roughly Englished, as a Dean Stanley is not at hand, in the following manner:—

I thank thee, poet, who hast taught my Greek
 In learned verse to British ears to speak.
 For in thy hands my Muse, so fame has told,
 Has gained fresh laurels, while she keeps the old.

I do not know whether my uncle consciously wished to make out that Sophocles had learnt to write Latin in Elysium : but, for some reason or other, he himself almost gave up writing Greek verse (of which he was a master) in his later years. Professor Campbell, however, replied in good Greek, expressing his modesty in receiving such a compliment.

ὦ μάκαρ, οἶόν μ' εἶπες · ἄγῃ μ' ἔχει · ὡς δέ με τιμᾶς,
εὐφημοῖμ' ἂν ἐγώ, σὴν χάριν ἀζόμενος.

I must again be interpreter, though rather too tersely :—

With awe thy praise I hear, O spirit blest !
In silence to receive such grace is best.

Another longer set of verses shows how the friendship had grown in closer acquaintance at St. Andrews (10 December, 1878).

To Professor Campbell on his recovery from bronchitis.

Gratulor optatæ morbum cessisse medelæ
Qui sæva indiderat gutture tela tuo ;
Gutturo quo non est aliud præstantius ullum
Docta mellifluos edere voce modos.
Non erat indignum Phœbo succurrere vati,
Phœbicolæ pubis quem chorus omnis amat.
Ipse salutifero miscens tibi pocula succo
Pæonia curans jam levat arte gulam.
Ergo omnes illi lætum Pæana canamus,
Seu Vir sive Deus suppeditavit opem.

He imagined Phœbus, the healer (Pæonius) as well as harper, to have a particular tenderness for one who was so sweet a singer, and to have himself mixed the medicines for his throat. So all must sing a ' Pæan ' in his praise.

After he had been a few years at St. Andrews, he received the nineteenth volume published by Dr. Boyd—a frequent and always kindly correspondent—who from being

a 'Country Parson' had now come to be Incumbent of the Parish Church of the ancient city. The reader will I think acknowledge that the compliment was both pretty and appropriate.

Rustico Pastori, hodiè urbano

Pastor fraternus

Undevicesimo ejus volumine gratissimè recepto.

Quot fessos homines, quot tristia corda, quot ægros,
 Quot passim indociles otia longa pati,
 Te recreans, scriptis recreâsti, Rustice Pastor :
 Nec tot post annos charta diserta silet !
 Non equidem invideo, miror magis : et prece posco,
 Hæc vita in tantis dum sit agenda malis,
 Ut saliens velut in deserto jugis aquæ fons,
 Ingenii exundans sic tua vena fluat.

In lectulo ante lucem,
 Jan. XV. 1879.

The sense may be given somewhat in this fashion :

How many years have sickness, toil and grief,
 And blank ennui that cannot kill the time,
 Turned to these 'Recreations' for relief !
 Yet still the Country Parson's lively chime
 Sounds a fresh note. I grudge not, but admire :
 And pray, since life must fare through all these ills,
 That, like a moorland spring which cannot tire,
 Thy bounteous vein may flow in ceaseless rills.

The wish with which the little poem concludes was fulfilled ; and the Bishop had an opportunity of gracefully acknowledging, I think, a twenty-second and even a twenty-third volume.

A more serious note is struck in the following elegy on Principal Tulloch, dated 8 April, 1886. There is no doubt that my uncle felt his death as a real personal loss, and as a loss to the cause he had so much at heart : for Tulloch

was a strong man and a thorough Scotsman, who might have carried his countrymen with him farther perhaps than any man of his generation. The fact, too, that at this period the Bishop was on less happy terms than usual with his own colleagues in the Episcopate perhaps sharpened his sense of loss. At any rate there is a strength of mournful eloquence about this elegy which goes far beyond the strain of mere compliment, and which I feel sure went no little way towards revealing the Bishop's sympathy with Scottish character to the best among his contemporaries.

*In Obitum Viri Reverendi Joannis Tulloch, S. T. P.,
Collegii S. Mariæ Præsidis, &c., &c., &c.*

'In quem illud elogium: Uno ore plurimi consentiunt Populi Primarium fuisse Virum.'—Cic. *De Fin.* ii. 35; *De Senect.* 17.

OCCIDIT heu! nimiùm celeri quem morte peremptum
Præstantem luget Scotia tota Virum:—
Præstantem ingenio, quod sursum et ad optima tendens
Provexit studiis excoluitque labor:
Præstantem eloquio, quod nunquam Ecclesia frustrâ
Certam in re dubiâ ferre petebat opem.
Ah! ubi, quem multos Academia nostra per annos
Fovit dulce decus præsidiumque sinu?
Ah! ubi nunc facies, risusque, et regia formæ
Majestas verâ simplicitate placens?
Quærimus incassum! Sed non evanuit omnis,
Constanti vitâ quem sibi finxit, honos.
Egregia assidui remanent monumenta laboris,
Nec Tempus poterit perdere mentis opus:
Nec desiderium, fidiq̄ue insignia luctûs
Cessabunt abitum vix numeranda sequi.
Partiri nostrum dignata est ipsa dolorem
Regina, et lacrymas consociare suas.
Quinetiam afflictum post Te superesse recusat—
Teque obeunte vetus nunc obit Officium.

C. W.

I am glad to have the opportunity of translating these pathetic lines.

Fallen, alas! in death, and far too soon,
All Scotland mourns thee for her foremost man.
Foremost in upward mind, whose high-set aims
Were trained by study to yet higher range.
Foremost in eloquent speech, whom ne'er in vain
The Church invoked in doubtful circumstance.
Ah! where is he, so long the pride and shield
Of all our academic brotherhood?
Ah! where the face, the smile, the majesty
Of royal person, with its simple charm?
In vain we seek it. But the end remains—
Honour, the goal of his consistent life,
And those memorials of his patient days,
The mind's brave work, which Time cannot destroy.
Nor lacks there evidence in mournful pomp
Of faithful grief that follows to his grave
In ranks scarce numbered. Our great Sovereign deigns
Herself to share our grief, and joins her tears.
Nay that old Dignity, which graced thy name,
Falls with thy fall and wills not to survive.

The Bishop was naturally on excellent terms also with Principal Shairp, whose sympathies with Keble and Wordsworth as poets, and with literary life and thought at Oxford and in England generally, were so much akin to his own. Mrs. Shairp was sister of Bishop Douglas of Bombay; and the Principal was a correspondent of Bishop Patteson. But Shairp was not at all an ecclesiastical statesman, and had no liking for Wordsworth's Reunion aspirations; he thought them indeed unpractical, and of little moment in comparison with the need of restoration of faith in fundamentals, the absence of which troubled him much more than division between Christian bodies. In fact Shairp was at once a poet and a lover of the poetical side of Presbyterianism, while Tulloch was probably more aware

of its practical defects, or at any rate felt more bound to try and rectify them.

In his later years the Bishop saw probably most of Professor Knight, a member of his own communion, and of congenial interests and pursuits. Together they founded the 'Wordsworth Society;' together they walked, and played whist or read Shakespeare in the evenings, and in many ways made each other's lives happier. Those who have the happiness to know Professor Knight can easily imagine how his nature and character fitted him for this genial ministry to an elder friend.

Another interest at St. Andrews besides the professors and students, was found in the girls' school called 'St. Leonard's,' which succeeded him at Bishopshall. It was, however, just before the time of his move to Kilrymont, already recorded, that the school met with its greatest success in the person of a former pupil, Miss Agnata Ramsay, now Mrs. Montagu Butler. She appeared at the head of the Classical Tripos at Cambridge—or rather *alone* in the first division of the first class—and therefore as Senior Classic, on 18 June, 1887, the year of the Queen's first Jubilee. The Bishop could not let the occasion pass, which brought honour to a family long known for its scholarship, and indeed was felt as a remarkable event throughout the whole country. I print the lines, with his own translation, from 'St. Leonard's School Gazette' of November 1887.

*Ad Agnatam Ramsay, Cantabrigiæ in Classico Tripode
facile Principem.*

Salve inter doctos Tu doctior unica, salve,
 (Si vox quid valeat nostra) puella viros!
 Digna novæ tellus pariat cui germina frondis,
 Quâ tua circumdet tempora Granta vetus.
 Non prius audito tibi consonat Anglia plausu;
 Te propriâ jactat Scotia laude suam.

Optimus exultat Patruus meliore propinquâ,
 Præclarus natâ nobiliore Pater.
 Aurêo te gaudens anno Victoria donis,
 Successu Agnatæ lætior ipsa, beat.
 Ante omnes in honore tuo Schola nostra triumphat,
 Vix tantum credens se genuisse decus.

Translation

Maid, among learned men more learn'd than all
 Hail, doubly hail, if aught my feeble voice
 Can speak to greet thee! Worthy art thou for whom
 Earth should bring forth some new-leaved plant, wherewith
 Old Granta lovingly might deck thy brow.
 England with thy applause, unheard of, rings:—
 Scotland more fondly claims thee for her own:—
 Thy Uncle—Father—each renowned, exults
 To find his honoured name eclipsed by thine:—
 Our Queen, more glad even in her golden year
 Thro' thy success, adorns thee with a gift:—
 But more than all our School thy triumph shares,
 Wondering to think she gave such glory birth.

C. W.

St. Andrews, 18 July, 1887.

The St. Andrews verses may be fitly concluded with the following on the 'Scarlet Gown,' which is very striking there in the old grey streets, and now is worn by female students as well as male, though I believe it is not peculiar to that University.

The following mottoes were prefixed to the little Poem.

'Thy habit rich, not gaudy,
 For the apparel doth proclaim the man.'—*Hamlet*, i. 3.
 'Amictus corporis . . . nuntiat hominem qualis sit.'—*EccLUS.* xix. 30.
 'Est pudor . . . qui adducit gloriam et gratiam.'—*Ib.* iv. 21.

Qua juxta Eoos urbs antiquissima fluctus
 Præteriti decoris flet monumenta sui,
 Rubra spectanda est Academica veste Juventus,
 Rubra splendescit veste palæstra¹ virûm.

¹ The Links.

Miranti istius quænam sit causa coloris
 Nescio quis ridens talia voce refert :—
 Non color iste sapit rubicundi pocula Bacchi,
 Non fera sanguinea prælia gesta manu :
 Ingenui signum est proprium, mihi crede, pudoris,
 Quem vita, ut quisque est optimus, ore gerit.
 Quis nescit quantum studiis urbs nostra severis,
 Quis nescit quantum floreat arte pilæ ?
 Adde virum ¹ nostros qui nunc ornatque regitque
 Judicio princeps eloquioque gregis :—
 Et quum Naturâ sit tanta modestia nobis,
 Quid mirum est ipsas erubuisse togas ?

XXVI. Nov. 1878.

Professor Campbell translated these lines into Greek in his *ἀθυρμάτια*. I have tried my hand at rendering them in an easier mode.

The Scarlet Gown

Where by the Eastern waves an old-world town
 Mourns the memorials of her vanished fame,
 Her Student Youth shines forth in Scarlet Gown,
 In scarlet shine the votaries of her game.

‘Why was that colour chosen?’ should you ask,—
 A smiling friend may bid you understand,
 This vesture doth no Wine-god’s worship mask,
 Nor tell of foemen slain with blood-red hand.

’Tis the true sign of modest bashfulness,
 Whereby each good man’s inner life is shown.
 Severe our Studies all men must confess :
 Who knows not Golf has brought us just renown ?

Then too our Rector—whose unrivalled powers,
 Wisdom and Eloquence, make fitting head—
 Sure, since such natural Modesty is ours,
 ’Tis only right our gown should blush so red.

¹ Lord Selborne, installed Rector on Thursday, 21 November, 1878.

Two other pleasant little epigrams addressed to clergy, one of the Established Church, and one of his own, may fitly close this section. The first is to Dr. Macgregor 'on the sermon he preached and the salmon he caught at Pitlochry.'

'Ipse capi voluit : quid apertius ?'—JUVENAL.

Qui captas hominum mentes sermone disertio
 Piscator, Pastor, Rhetor Apostolicus,
 Quid mirum si præda tuo successerit hamo ?
 Credebat mutis te dare posse sonum.¹

[Fisher who catchest men, and Pastor true,
 And Orator of Apostolic skill,
 To thy charmed hook of right the salmon flew,
 Who thought the gift of speech was at thy will.]

The second is to the Rev. N. Johnston (afterwards Dean) in acknowledging his gift of a 'wideawake,' 7 October, 1878.

Auspiciam accipio monitumque fidelis amici,
 Donatus hocce pileo.
 Præsulis officium nempe est constanter ἀγρυπνέειν
 Lateque tutari gregem ;
 Se præstare habilem cunctis, et in omnibus æquam
 Servare mentem casibus !

[A present so proper I thankfully take ;
 My friend for the warning I praise.
 'Tis a Bishop's first duty to keep ' wide awake,'
 And to watch that his flock never strays ;
 His presence to all men convenient to make,
 And to keep even temper always.]

3. *The Wykehamist Dinner of 1880 and Athletics.*

It is an easy transition from these Academic amenities—the value of which I estimate highly, for good Latin Verse

¹ 'O mutis quoque piscibus
 Donatura cyeni, si libeat, sonum.'—HORACE.

is like a royal compliment, and is not given to or by everyone—to the Wykehamist dinner of 1880 at which the Bishop was chairman. His principal speech on the occasion contains a lesson against excessive devotion to athletics which is equally necessary eighteen years later :¹

In speaking to this toast upon this occasion, I am naturally reminded of the excellent address delivered in October last by our right rev. Visitor, at the re-opening of New College Chapel, on the 500th anniversary of its foundation. The key-note of that address was the great benefit which had been derived from the combination of divine and human elements, or, in other words, of sacred and secular learning, in our system of school and college education—a combination originally due to the practical good sense, the wisdom, and the piety of our illustrious founder, William of Wykeham. The worthy prelate who now occupies our founder's Episcopal throne invited us to imagine what would have been the state of our country, and of the English nation at the present time, if, instead of that combination, those who had gone before us had been trained in the opposite system, now recommended by visionaries and sceptics, wherein secular and sacred learning are to be kept apart, and the latter, perhaps, altogether ignored. And, in illustration of his remarks, he was able to point to a result which we ourselves have witnessed—namely, the highest lay office in the kingdom held in succession by two such men and two such Wykehamists as Lord Hatherley and Lord Selborne—men who, to borrow words from the well-known verses of the latter, had been trained alike

‘ In the nurture of good learning, and in God's most holy fear.’

And the Bishop might have mentioned also a third, as a scarcely less eminent example of the same kind, and in the same profession of the law, one who has been taken from us since his address was spoken—I mean Sir William Erle—a man whom all men have conspired to praise for the uniform purity and integrity and benevolence of his character both in public and

¹ From the report in the *Guardian*, of 23 June, reprinted in the *Scottish Guardian* of 2 July.

private life. The combination of which our Visitor spoke afforded a topic admirably suited to the occasion, the place, and the audience he was then addressing. There is another combination upon which I would wish to offer a few words; and which, being of a less solemn nature, and yet, I am persuaded, of no small importance, will not, I hope, be considered inappropriate to this festive meeting; I allude to the relationship which ought to exist between the *erga* and the *parerga*, the *paideia* and the *paidia*, the work and the play, as pursued under our present system of school and college education. And, adopting the form of appeal which our Visitor employed, I would ask you to imagine what would have been the condition of our country now—what would have been its rank in the scale of nations as a Divine instrument of progress and civilisation throughout the world if, ever since the days of William of Wykeham, the same prominence had been given to athletic sports and exercises which we have seen given to them in recent years. For myself I need scarcely say that I am a staunch advocate of such exercises as an indispensable element in all good education. And it is because I value them so highly that I would wish to utter a warning against their abuse. Perhaps, too, as coming from me the warning may carry greater weight, or, at least, may be more readily excused. For no one, I think, can have enjoyed a wider or more pleasurable experience of athletic sports, both at school and college—and, I may add, no one can have derived from them greater or more lasting advantages—than I have done. May I mention some particulars of my experience? When the annual cricket match between Harrow and Eton was first permanently set on foot in 1822, I was in the eleven of that year, and also of '23, '24, and '25. Also, in 1825 I played in the first match between Harrow and Winchester, being then captain of the Harrow eleven. Also, in Oxford against Cambridge, I played as one of the Oxford eleven in the first two matches—viz. in 1827 at Lord's, and in 1829 at Oxford; and we won in both. Moreover, I took the principal part in getting up the first Inter-University Boat-race in 1829; and was one of the Oxford eight, pulling four, with a good Wykehamist before me pulling six—Tom Garnier, son of the late Dean of Winchester, and himself afterwards Dean of Lincoln. In that year (1829) the cricket match and the boat-race were both in the

same week—the former on Friday at Oxford, and the latter on Wednesday at Henley—and in both we were victorious. This last experience, I suppose, must be quite unique. But the advantages I have derived from athletic exercises deserve much more my grateful commemoration. It was tennis that first made me acquainted with Warden Barter; it was cricket that first made me acquainted with Bishop Moberly; it was rowing that first made me acquainted with Bishop Selwyn. It was cricket that improved my acquaintance with the present Warden of Winchester. Again, it was cricket and quoits that made me acquainted with luxuries—*Pontificum potiora cœnis*—I mean the draught beer, and the mutton chop, hot from the gridiron in the kitchen of New College; as preparatory to the annual cricket match of Christ Church and New College against the University; or as introductory to a game of quoits, then sometimes played (I am ashamed to remember) within the precincts of the college cloisters. And yet here I am, at the end of a long life, to bear witness against the altered relationship which, it appears to me, has arisen of late years between such exercises and the graver and more substantial studies of which they form at once the necessary diversion, and the graceful—if only the subordinate—accompaniment. Shall I overstate the case if I say that an agreement would almost seem to have been entered into between the teacher and the taught of the new generation to commit, if I may so express it, a huge false quantity, or rather two false quantities in one—viz. to make *paidia*—the play—long, and to make *paideia*—the education—short? And yet it is not so much the shortness or the length of time spent upon each, of which I would complain, as of the undue interest which now, by almost general consent, attaches to the former in comparison with the latter. It is not long since I read a leading article in the ‘Times’ which contained these words: ‘At the Universities every tutor will tell you that athletics rank at least on a level with the humanities.’ But we have more important testimony even than that of the ‘Times’ to the same effect. When one of the most distinguished gymnasts of the day, while still a young man, comes forward—and that, too, in the interests not so much of intellectual culture as of simple sobermindedness—to protest against the evil, and to endeavour to provide a remedy—as Mr. Edward Lyttelton has done in a recent number of the ‘Nine-

teenth Century'—we may feel sure that the time has fully arrived when something ought to be done to bring about a reform, not so much of athleticism itself (though I venture to think I could suggest amendments in the present practice both of rowing and cricket), as of its disproportionate encouragement and inordinate excess. And as a reformer—a Conservative reformer—of this class, I confess I should wish to see the maxim of the wise Scythian Anacharsis, which Aristotle has preserved, and which supplies the only true and sound principle for our guidance in the matter, inserted in the *Tabula Legum* of every school and college throughout the kingdom—*παίξειν ὅπως σπουδάζης*, which, interpreted Wykehamically, is—'Play that you may *sap*.' You will not, I hope, suppose that because I have ventured to make these remarks upon this occasion I consider that Wykehamists require them more than others; for certainly I entertain no such opinion. But I have made them to the present company because I believe the influence of New College and of Winchester to be so great, and so well deserved, under our present rulers, that any reform encouraged or set on foot by them, so far as it may be needed, could not fail to be productive of beneficial results far beyond the range of our own body. At all events, let me trust that what I have said may be taken in good part, out of consideration of the motive which alone has prompted me to say it, and which I shall best express when I utter the sentiment of the toast I have now to give—'Prosperity to the two St. Mary Winton Colleges.'

In a subsequent speech at the same dinner, the Bishop of St. Andrews, in replying to the toast of his health, proposed by the Right Hon. Selater-Booth, M.P., one of the new Governing Body of Winchester College—after mentioning various particulars relating to his connection with Winchester—went on to say:

But I can also lay claim to a Wykehamical association of another, and to me, very interesting kind. How it came about I cannot tell; and perhaps no one here present has ever heard of the curious fact to which I allude. One of my Episcopal predecessors in the See of Dunkeld, Bishop Nicholas, was employed by William of Wykeham, in the year 1400—four years

before his death—to act for him in consecrating the cloisters and cemetery of New College, and also three of the bells of the great tower. The petition for the consecration by the then warden, Richard Malford, and all his scholars, addressed to Bishop Nicholas, and also the Deed executed by my Scotch predecessor in testimony of the consecration, are both preserved among the muniments of New College; and soon after I became Bishop twenty-seven years ago, the then Bursar and Librarian—now the honoured Warden of the College—was so kind as to favour me with a copy of them, which I still preserve.

The reader will notice how, in the midst of the homily, the ‘natural man’ breaks out; and there is no doubt that the youthful, sanguine, athletic temperament, which had much to do with the success, and sometimes with the failure, of the subject of this memoir, remained with him to the end of life. Perhaps as good an evidence of it as can be given is this short entry in his Diary for 24 October, 1890, in his eighty-fifth year: ‘My first game of golf with K., on Ladies’ Links.’ Up to that time I believe he had rather ‘vilipended’ that ancient game. A much fuller example is in the article ‘Pindar and Athletics, Ancient and Modern’ in the ‘National Review’ for April 1888, in which he discoursed at length on the subject originally for the benefit of the students of St. Andrews. There is much good advice in the address, and much apt classical quotation, for which, as regards Pindar, he had recourse to Bishop Moberly’s admirable translation. But the striking thing in it is the broad knowledge of the subject and the evident sympathy with which it is written.

The following letter on skating addressed to Mr. W. Earl Hodgson, a young friend of later years, to whom, as to Canon Farquhar, the Bishop opened out with great freedom, is worth reading even by those who are not proficient in that delightful exercise.

On Skating

Kilrymont: 23 November, 1887.

My dear Mr. Hodgson,—Yesterday's article on 'Skating' is very good. Whoever wrote it understands his subject *well*; which is not always the case with those who undertake to discourse upon athletics. I venture to speak with some authority, as I was one of the best—if not *the* best—of the skaters at Oxford in my day. As a boy and young man I never missed a day's, or a night's, skating, when it was to be had, even at some risk of life; and consequently I had a narrow escape of drowning on more than one occasion—once at Harrow, and again at Oxford. At Berlin, in the winter of 1833, I made quite a sensation; no one could come near me in cutting figures! But more than that, I may claim to have been a pioneer in the most important of the improvements to which the said article refers. I was the first man at Oxford to have a pair of skates made *without* 'the curious, up-curling thing in front,' which was *functionless*, and *with* the blade curved up at heel, which is *essential* to skating backwards with ease and safety. I had the advantage—which your writer justly observes is *rare*—of being equally strong and *steady* on both feet, which enabled me to do the outside edge *backwards*, as easily as I did it forwards; and I was master of the 'cross-cuts' in both. 'It is possible to have the blades over-fine.' Yes; quite true. But I rather demur to a remark that follows: the curved blade has, *certainly*, 'much revealed the gymnastic possibilities of skating;' but I doubt whether it ought to 'go further.' There are some figures such as the 'Flying Mercury'—one of the grandest of all—which could scarcely be performed without a considerable portion of the blade being in contact with the ice. So in this, as in other *more important* matters, we must have a *compromise*; and the wisest plan is to keep to the '*via media*'!

Yours sincerely,

C. W., Bp.

This letter naturally led to a request for an explanation of the 'Flying Mercury,' which was given a few days later (29 November).

Take a run at full speed, end with short stroke outside edge on right foot, then throw yourself round on left foot, and take, with outside edge backward, *as long a sweep as you can*.

The difficulty is to throw yourself round at *full speed*, and it requires great strength of foot, and no little skill, to avoid a heavy fall at the turn. When the feat is well performed, it produces a very fine effect. I only know one man, Cyril Page, who was with me at Christ Church, and was afterwards a leading member of the London Skating Club, who was pretty sure of doing it well. He was of a tall, graceful figure, bold, and very firm on his skates.

4. *Revival or continuation of old friendships. Literary correspondence. Manning, Newman, &c.*

It is characteristic of the two English Cardinals that the revival of a certain amount of intercourse with Cardinal Manning was due to a cricketing reminiscence, while Newman's letter was elicited by a present of Latin translations from Keble. The Bishop in 1882 wrote a letter to the 'St. Andrews Gazette' headed 'Mr. Gladstone and Cardinal Manning more than fifty years since,' correcting some inaccurate statements as to their athletic performances. It was followed by a letter of some interest from Manning.

Archbishop's House, Westminster, S.W. :
6 October, 1882.

My very dear old Friend,—I have just read your letter in the Fifehire paper. It comes to me like a kind voice from an old world : and I must answer it. How many times I have been on the point of writing to you and to your brother in these last years I cannot tell you. For I have cherished all our old affection with great fidelity and warmth. I have not written to either of you, not knowing whether it would be acceptable. From the year 1851 I have rejoiced to renew my intercourse with all who sought it ; but I have never made the first advance.

And now for your letter. It brings back many happy memories of Harrow. I can see you in your broad-brimmed

white hat and green cut-away coat: the admiration and envy of all beholders. It reminds me of how much I owe you in my books: and of your original ingratitude, for you know that I coached you in logic. I have also other memories as to how, the Bishop of St. Andrews and the Bishop of Lincoln preventing me, the Grape House at Coombe Bank was entered by the roof and robbed.

If you have the other verses from which you quote the thanks for the bat, I should much like to see them. I have burnt almost all the doggrel of those days.

I hope you are well in health. We have a long score to be thankful for; you, I think, 76, and I 74 years.

It would give me much pleasure to hear your voice again if you ever come south.

Believe me, my dear Friend,

Yours affectionately,

HENRY E. C[ARD]. MANNING.

Dean Merivale's memory was also stirred to compare past and present in regard to their old Harrow comrade. He writes (28 November) thus:

Your reminiscences of Manning are amusing enough. He was quite a crony of mine at Harrow, though I have seen very little of him since. I liked him notwithstanding his singular affectation. I just now recall to mind how once in playing cricket with him he hit a ball with a very pretty curve to the off and thereupon, instead of making his run, threw his bat back on his shoulder, exclaiming 'I say, Merivale, what a mysterious thing a cricket ball is!' And so he has gone on—and 'sibi constat.'

The intercourse thus affectionately renewed was kept up to some extent, but the Bishop never could bring himself to conquer the distrust with which 'perverts' inspired him. Pointing to their works on his bookshelves he would say, 'These are my black sheep.' Yet he was not bitter in controversy with them, nor did he fail to keep up kindly memories of past days.

The letter from Newman was, as I have said, elicited by a present of the Bishop's translations of those parts of Keble's 'Christian Year' which refer to and describe the Church's Ministry, to which he also added some beautiful versions of Ken's hymns, written at Winchester, and presented to the boys there many years before. The Bishop had perhaps a special right to do such a work for Keble, having been asked by him to revise the Latin of his famous 'Prælectiones,' and especially the dedication to the Poet Wordsworth, of which a translation is on the memorial slab in Grasmere Church.

(From *J. H. Newman—thanks for present of 'Anni Christiani &c.'*)

Birmingham: 13 November, 1882.

My dear Bishop of St. Andrews,—Thank you for your beautiful gift. The binding and letterpress are worthy of the translations, and the translations (as far as I have read them) are worthy of their originals in the 'Christian Year.'

It is not the first of my books with your name in it as the donor. You gave me in 1844 Wetstein's 'Greek Testament,' which has a place in our Oratory Library, as the present gift will have, as lasting memorial, of you, when I am gone.

I am, my dear Bishop, Most truly yours,

JOHN H. CARD. NEWMAN.

The Bishop of St. Andrews.

The following criticism of Newman represents my uncle's feeling about him, of which he has left several similar expressions.

To W. Earl Hodgson, Esq. (On J. H. Newman)

Rydal Lodge, Ambleside: 17 August, 1890.

Your few remarks upon Newman in 'Rod and Gun' have interested me much. They are more to *the point* than almost anything else that (so far as I have seen) has been written about him. I cannot regard the *incense* that is being offered, so uni-

versally, to his memory as a *healthy* sign. It proves to me that we are living in an age of *indifference* to *Truth*, or at least of *restlessness* near akin to it. Newman's mind was essentially *sceptical*; but his own disposition, on the whole, was amiable, and his *intellectual gifts* being of the *very highest* order, the world is content to regard his scepticism as a *recommendation* rather than the contrary. You seem to *know* his 'Grammar of Assent.' It is a *stiff* book, and required more time than I had to give to it, and perhaps more thought than I have at command; but there are some brilliant passages in it, which I remember imperfectly, especially towards the end. Would it not be worth your while to write an article which should give something like a just estimate of the nature of Newman's influence? Do you know his *Sermons*? They are of *real* value, and I suppose no other sermons ever written or preached have produced so much effect. And that effect will *endure*. But I doubt if the same can be said of *any* of his other works. As to his *moral fibre*—it was *not* of the strongest. (You know I think the same of Manning.) He was not *ambitious* in the same sense as Manning; but he was *morbidly* sensitive, when attacked, or *not appreciated* as his conscience told him he deserved to be; and he allowed himself to act under that irritation—which is not the sign of a truly great man.

This may be a fitting place to record several similar judgments addressed to friends old and new.

To W. Earl Hodgson, Esq. (On Abp. Trench)

Whitemoor: 12 September.

. . . Archbishop Trench and I were at Harrow together in the *same* Dame's House, and in the *same* Remove; but he went to Cambridge and I to Oxford—so that I almost lost sight of him till (1) he invited me to preach one of the first sermons when he began the *nave* services at Westminster Abbey; (2) we met as the two fellow preachers at Stratford on occasion of the Shakespeare Tercentenary; and (3) again afterwards as Fellow Members of the N. T. Revision Company. Take him all in all he was one of the most remarkable men of the present century. Every thing he did—and he did an *enormous* amount of work of various

kinds—showed great *industry* and *talent* combined, and his *character* in every respect was *first rate*.

To Dean Boyle. (On Baxter)

Bishopshall, St. Andrews : 3 December, 1883.

My dear Dean,—I have been much too long in writing to thank you for your kindness in sending me a copy of your 'Baxter'; but I only *finished it* last night. It could not fail to be interesting in your hands, and you have done him, I think, full justice. There is no doubt he was a 'man to be remembered' and a man from whom if one does not learn much it is one's own fault. But somehow or other he is also a *disappointing* man. He was thinking always of what he was to do *individually*—no doubt, from the best motives and with the best intentions—and I am afraid he never *practically grasped* the idea of 'the Church' and of the duties which flow from *Church membership*. And the consequence was he produced little *lasting fruit* in comparison with his enormous amount of labour, and self-sacrifice, and to some extent he *stood in the way* so as to prevent good, with which he did not fully sympathise, being done by others—a curious combination of *high* and *low*, *broad* and *narrow*, *charitable* and *uncharitable*.

At p. 23, and again at p. 93, you refer to his saying: 'To despise earth is easy to me, but not so easy to be acquainted and conversant with Heaven.' I do not suppose that my uncle was ever a great reader of 'Baxter'; and you will remember a remarkable parallel in the 'Excursion' (Book iv.):

' 'Tis by comparison an easy task
Earth to despise; but to converse with Heaven
This is not easy &c.'

With kind regards to Mrs. Boyle,

I am Ever yours sincerely,

C. W., Bp.

(Clarendon &c.)

Rydal Lodge, Ambleside : 27 August, 1889.

My dear Dean,—I am not yet *good* for much writing, but I must not any longer omit to thank *you heartily*—and to beg you

to thank with *no less warmth* Mrs. Smythe, and my other kind friends at Methven—for your affectionate remembrances and good wishes on the occasion of my birthday, which please to believe—and to say to all concerned—were *most welcome* and highly gratifying to the receiver.

I have also to thank you sincerely for your valuable present of the ‘Selections from Clarendon’ which reached me here not long ago. It is only about four years since I read the history through, and I remember thinking at the time what a good thing it would be if some one would undertake what you have so successfully performed. Much of the mere narrative is heavy and uninteresting, and the style crude and clumsy in the extreme; so that the book, which *in the main* is so *instructive*, has found, I should fear, in these days very few readers: and your volume of ‘Selections’ is just *what was wanted*. You have forgotten, I dare say, if you ever saw, what I wrote in recommendation of the History as a study for the young, in my St. Cuthbert’s lecture (1886) ‘The Yoke of Christ to be borne in youth’—and the remarkable testimony of Lord Grenville (the Whig Prime Minister) which I *there quote* (p. 22 sq. note), to its value and impartiality. You might like to see the passage; and I dare say Mrs. Symthe can lend you the lecture. . . . With our united kindest regards,

Ever yours most sincerely,

C. W., Bp.

(Hooker, ‘*Plea for Justice, 1866*’—Gladstone’s *Review of ‘Ellen Middleton’*)

St. Andrews: 12 January, 1890.

My dear Dean,—Many thanks for your kind words of sympathy . . . and also for your present of ‘The Churchman’ containing your paper on Hooker. Your memory has made a slight slip at p. 187. It was not Tulloch’s article (an excellent one) in the ‘North British Review’ which brought me into friendly controversy with him; but a lecture delivered first to his Divinity Students here, and afterwards in Edinburgh, in which he claimed not only Leighton, but Hooker, as ‘having no faith in Episcopacy,’ and regarding it only as ‘the best ecclesiastical organisation, historically considered.’ It was this

which called forth my 'Plea for Justice to Presbyterian Students of Theology and to the Scotch Episcopal Church, 1866.' I wish I had some copies remaining of that 'Plea.' I have only *one* bound up with other pamphlets. I think I gave the last to Barry, who mentions it in a note of his sermon on Hooker to which you refer. By-the-bye, do you see that Gladstone says he has *not* a *single* copy remaining of his Review of 'Ellen Middleton'? I am more fortunate; for I possess the copy which he gave me soon after it appeared. It is written with great ability; but the influence of Newman and of the Oxford School, under which he was at that time, is very obvious. I am not surprised that he thought it *more prudent* not to reprint it among his 'Gleanings.' What must he think of some of his leading followers if he now retains those sentiments!

The following extract from Canon Farquhar's Diary is too characteristically exact to be omitted, and it contains a judgment on two previous Scottish Bishops.

The Bishop's orderliness. Bishops John and William Skinner

14 September, 1887.—A minute ago I put down the newspaper which I was reading. Whereupon the Bishop said, 'You don't consider yourself a model of tidiness, do you? You don't *fold up* your newspapers—like this—as I always do when I have done with them.' Indeed, his tidiness is something extraordinary; his library is in the most beautiful order, and though he has close on 7,000 volumes, he seems to know what each volume is without looking at it. Mrs. Wordsworth says that, when they were travelling in Italy, however long a day's journey they had just completed, the Bishop never sat down till he had re-arranged the sitting-room to his satisfaction. At breakfast this morning the Bishop said, 'I see Dr. Walker is going to bring out a "Life" of Primus John Skinner.' *I.*: 'That will be interesting.' *Bishop*: 'Interesting enough to those who have not read—that volume over there. The union with the qualified chapels is the main point of interest. But neither Bishop John nor Bishop William Skinner had much real *genius*. William especially was heavy—but good, solid men. I wish we had more

like them now! Plenty of common sense and knowledge of the people.'

In July 1885 Dean Charles Merivale (of Ely), who was our uncle by marriage, asked one of my sisters to find him a good English verse translation of the following lines of Statius, which described very fitly the circumstances of his own father's death and his character:

Quid referam expositos, servato pondere, mores?
 Quæ pietas? quam vile lucrum? quæ cura pudoris?
 Quantus amor recti? rursusque ubi dulce remitti
 Gratia quæ dictis? animo quam nulla senectus?
 . . . Raperis, genitor, non indignus ævi,
 Non nimius; trinisque decem quinquennia lustris
 Juncta ferens; sed nec leti tibi janua tristis;

.

Sed te torpor iners, et mors imitata quietem
 Explicuit, falsoque tulit sub Tartara somno.

'Silvarum' lib. v. 3, 246 foll.

My sister forwarded them to the Bishop of St. Andrews, which drew from him the following letter to his old friend Merivale—who was an even greater master of Latin verse of the 'silver age' than the Bishop, though not equal to him in the language of the Augustan period.

The Stepping Stones, Ambleside: 28 July, 1885.

My dear Merivale,—A note received here this morning from my niece Susan W. informs me that you wish to have 'a good English verse translation' of some Latin lines which she encloses. The lines are remarkable. I did not know that Statius—from what I remember of him—had written anything so good (except the 'Mosella,'¹ which is *almost* equal—not quite—to your famous 'Hexameters on Skating'!). They deserve a *good* translation; but this I cannot promise you. However, I have tried my hand, and send you the result—in blank verse. Rhyme I think would only *dilute* the force of the original.

¹ A slip of memory. The *Mosella* is by Ausonius.

Probably the best thing about my attempt is the place from whence it comes, viz. Rydal, where I am now staying for a short holiday.

Yours sincerely,
C. W., Bp.

Why tell how frank, with balance nicely held,
His character ! his piety how true !
The quest of gain abhorred, but Modesty
How strictly cherished, Rectitude how loved !
And when it pleased him to relax awhile,
How charmingly he talked ! while on his mind
Old age no wrinkle had prevailed to fix.
Sudden, my father, wast thou snatched away,
Not scant of years, nor aught too full, tho' past
The three score limit, Yet to thee Death came
Not sad ; but softly thro' the opening gate
He bore thee hence ; and lulled in mimic sleep
To th' unknown world thy Spirit passed away.

Rydal, 28 July, 1885.

The answer was dated Deanery, Ely, 1 August, 1885 :

Your letter reached me at Dawlish, whence we returned yesterday. I am glad to have elicited such a poetical spark from you. I don't think I ever saw a specimen of your English verse before, even though strained through the Latin, which I fancy is more congenial to both of us. My old friend Statius has many bits that are well worth remembering and not easily forgotten, though he did his best to make himself generally unreadable. The lines which have been laid before you take my fancy, particularly from the circumstances of his father's death being so exactly the same as my own father's, by a sudden fit at 65. I also flatter myself that the charming character so charmingly given was the same in both. I cannot give up rhyme in attempting to represent its sentiment in English—which seems more suitable to Pope than to Milton. The concise and rather crabbed antitheses of the original must be preserved, even at some sacrifice of the exact meaning of the words. I once urged Sir T. Martin to do for Statius, or portions of him, what he had done for Horace and Catullus, but he said the style was too

hard for him, too epigrammatic and suggestive, and so no doubt it is. Pope did the first book of the *Thebaid* in his own way (as a youth). I must look at it again.

I set my young ladies the task of rendering my prose translation of the Latin, and they set some of their young friends to work also—Elizabeth Wordsworth among them. I am not quite satisfied with any of their attempts, though they show much of the freedom and facility of verse-making for which the young ladies of the present day are deservedly famous. You shall have a copy of my poor old man's effort, for which I may plead Th. Martin's excuse also. The thing is too hard. You are certainly very exact in the meaning, and not less graceful in language; but, as I hinted, I think you wander away too far from the style and sentiments of the passage. You are too *Wordsworthian*.

[The following is the version enclosed.]

His spirit ever frank yet grave and plain,
 Steadfast his honour, proud his scorn of gain,—
 How strict his sense of right and love of good
 Yet sweet his converse in his softer mood.
 With mind unworn by age's slow distress,
 With no defect of years and no excess,
 To twice five lustres three he added more,
 Then lightly turned aside death's yielding door;
 Unnerved he swoon'd away in torpor laid,
 And sank as one asleep to nether shade.

C. M.

The classical reader will not be surprised when he is told that quite a controversy was once raised between these two eminent scholars as to the correctness of the form 'cæligenus' (heaven-born), which the Bishop asserted ought to have been 'cæligena.' It ended by the following post-card. On the top Merivale wrote, sticking to his method of formation as both ancient and revived in the 'Silver' age:

En ! pro vitigeno juvenilis carminis œstro
 Melligenus senio jam subeunte sapor.

C. M.

Below the Bishop replied by suggesting that in leaving the Latin of the Golden or Augustan age the Dean was likely to fall below the Silver into the Iron period.

At tua, posthabito linguæ meliore metallo,
Ne senio fiat *ferrea* musa, cave!

St. Andrews.

C. W., Bishop, 11 December, 1882.

Rev. W. Tuckwell's 'Tongues in Trees.'

Kilrymont, St. Andrews: 1 January, 1892.

What a gem of a book! One of my daughters has *fallen in love* with it, and carried it off. In turning over the pages I felt *drawn to it* in many ways. How can I sufficiently thank the author and kind giver? For many weeks and months I have been sadly troubled with constant and painful *eczema*—and am now *worse*—otherwise I should have written sooner, and should write more than I can do now. So you must kindly excuse me. Heartily wishing you all the blessings of the season, and a happy New Year—and many more to come—

‘Multos felices, ultimum felicissimum.’

The following is to a Scottish newspaper (name unknown), and written just two months before his death:

Lord Tennyson's Prize Poem, 1829.

St. Andrews, 7 October, 1892.

Sir,—In your interesting obituary notice of Lord Tennyson you mention that his Cambridge prize poem on Timbuctoo, ‘while not without faults, was not devoid of poetic promise,’ and that the promise was recognised by a favourable notice in the ‘Athenæum’: but you do not mention that the poem was in blank verse—a thing quite unheard of up to that time; so that the examiners deserved great credit for breaking through the tradition of rhyme, out of regard to the extraordinary merit of young Alfred Tennyson’s composition. It was under these circumstances that I gave my opinion of the poem, when an undergraduate at Oxford, in writing to my brother Christopher,

afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, and then an undergraduate at Cambridge, 4 September, 1829, as follows :

‘What do you think of Tennyson’s prize poem ? (Timbuctoo.) If such an exercise had been sent up at Oxford, the author would have had a better chance of being rusticated—with the view of his passing a few months in a lunatic asylum—than of obtaining the prize. It is certainly a wonderful production ; and if it had come out with Lord Byron’s name it would have been thought as fine as anything he ever wrote.’—I am, &c.,

CHARLES WORDSWORTH, Bishop of St. Andrews.

I have already chronicled certain points of renewed contact in later life with Mr. Gladstone ; but there was not much intercourse, and no thorough healing of old disagreement. Yet there is no doubt that he prized the following letter, of which an old Wykehamist and college friend, Sir J. E. Eardley-Wilmot, sent him a copy. It was dated December 1887 :—

My dear Sir,—It is extremely kind on your part to send me your ‘Florilegium,’ and I shall examine it with pleasure. In your dedication you have placed it under high protection. I at least admired very warmly the scholarship of Bishop Charles Wordsworth, altho’ I partook but little of its higher qualities.

Believe me, faithfully yours,

W. E. GLADSTONE.

This refers to the ‘Mentoni Florilegium,’ ed. 2, published by Stanford, London, in that year, with a dedication ‘Viro eruditissimo et Latinæ poeseos egregie studioso Carolo Wordsworth,’ &c. The postscript, in black edges, gives the history of the writer’s sojourn on the Riviera in words that too many an Englishman can echo. There are many musical lines and much good sense and sentiment, sometimes strong and sometimes gentle, in the other poems.

Spem mihi fallacem nimum, Mentone, dedisti ;

Ardebat vitæ lumine tæda brevi ;

Gaudia cum subitâ caligine vana recedunt ;

Mortua ploratur quæ mihi vita fuit.

As specimens of the long-continued intercourse with another friend—Bishop T. L. Claughton—I may give the following, which he amended for him :

Inscription on a bookcase given to Rev. G. D. Boyle, on his becoming Dean of Salisbury, by his old curates.

Viro admodum Reverendo
 Georgio Boyle, Decano Sarisburiensi,
 Presbyteri qui sub ipso Duce atque auspice amicissimo
 Dum Vicarii Kidderminsteriensis munere fungebatur
 animarum curæ concorditer inserviebant
 Hoc librorum armarium
 Amoris ac benevolentiae quantulumcunque indicium
 Dono Dederunt
 M D C C C L X X X

He constantly remembered his old friend's birthday (6 November), and in 1882 sent him the following epigram congratulating him on the successful operation for cataract which was performed on that day.

Fortunate dies duplici dignissime cretâ :
 Qui dederas lucem, restituisque datam !

[O happy day ! I mark thee doubly white :
 That gav'st my friend, and giv'st him back, the light.]

Claughton replied, from the Convocation House, April 1883, enclosing a suggested emendation of the Bishop (Durnford) of Chichester's, an older man than my uncle, and a delightful old-fashioned scholar.

Chichester thinks your couplet insufficient, and suggests :

‘ Fortunata dies ; lucem quæ prima dedisti
 Infanti, amissam restituisque seni.’

[‘ O happy day ! which gav'st my friend the light
 As infant, and in age restor'st his sight ’]

Rougher, but he thinks more complete.

Bishop Claughton lived to celebrate his golden wedding—having resigned his See from ill-health in February 1890—on 14 June, 1892, and his old friend did not forget him.

Tibi aurearum nuptiarum haud immemor,
Amice, amicus chartulam hanc mitto vetus,
Precans in æternum ut det omnia aurea
Tibi tuæque noster in cælo Pater.

Not mindless of thy golden wedding, friend,
I, friend of auld lang syne, this greeting send,
With prayers that God may all things golden pour
On thee and thine—now and for evermore !

He died 25 July of the same year, and my uncle less than five months later.

Another golden wedding some eight years earlier (22 December, 1884), that of the Bishop of Salisbury and Mrs. Moberly, had been commemorated rather more elaborately.

Quinquaginta annos vitæ tenor unus eodem
Consocians animas junxit amore duas.
Supplevit si quid deerat dulcedinis uxor,
Supplevit columen vir meritumque decus.
Interea circa mensam dum frondet oliva,¹
Quid possit pietas sensit uterque parens.
Hoc unum ambobus post cætera fausta precandum
Restat—ut ascendant ad meliora *simul*.

I hope that the family, to whose example and friendship I am so deeply indebted, will forgive me for rendering these lines so tamely :—

For fifty years an even path of life
Two close-knit souls in loving concord ran :
Were sweetness needed—promptly gave the wife ;
Were strength and honour—ready was the man.

¹ Ps. cxxviii. 4.

Green were the olive-branches round the board,
 And duteous children cheered each parent's eyes.
 This only now from Heaven may be implored,
 'To better worlds *together* may they rise.'

I am happy, however, to recollect that this prayer was not literally granted, and that after succeeding my dear old master, Bishop Moberly, in 1885, I had the invaluable privilege of enjoying Mrs. Moberly's friendship, counsel, and keenly sympathetic wit, for a number of happy years.

I should be wanting in dutiful affection if I did not acknowledge that the Bishop was kind enough to take a keen interest in his nephews' writings as well as in his brother's. I received from him an elaborate criticism of my Four Addresses on 'Holy Communion,' superior to any review with which (as far as I remember) the critics by profession favoured me, and, in earlier days, his commendation of my Bampton Lectures cheered me not a little. My brother Christopher, now Rector of St. Peter's, Marlborough, when he was still a young tutor at Cambridge, sent him, in 1874, a stout volume on 'University Social Life in the Eighteenth Century,' which was the expansion of a prize essay. The Bishop bantered him on its growth, and declared he could hardly conceive how it contrived to enter his room, and hoped the author had not grown to the same proportions. He characteristically picked out for comment a note about the two faldstools at Durham which were said to face eastwards, declaring that he had seen them, and that the two only did so because there was not good room for all on the sides where six others stood: and withal he drew a neat little plan of the arrangement. Writing to my father he said, 'What an interesting volume Chris has produced,' and he goes on to pity the next generation of Wordsworths (who would have to come up to so high a standard of quantity, quality, and bulk), and of

catalogue-makers, instancing the following entry he had just seen :

- Wordsworth (Bishop), *Ecclesiastical Biography* [really by the
Master of Trinity].
 _____ *On Scottish Reformation* [by Charles
Wordsworth].
 _____ *Occasional Sermons* [by Bishop Chr.
Wordsworth].

I remember how no less a man than Professor Mommsen once united my father, my uncle John, and myself, into a single personality.

5. *Last Publications in Verse and Prose executed and projected.*

The Bishop's ill-health was, as we have seen, the fruitful parent of poetical effusions. Probably the most striking of the humorous ones is that given below, which is equal to the occasion. It is on 'Night Mare,' and is worthy of being introduced to the English reader.

Equa Nocturna (Night Mare)

VÆ tibi quæ, fessis adimens solatia somni,
 Portenta haud cessans irrequieta creas ;
 Quæ facis ut formæ fiant informia cunctæ,
 Et caput et sensus nil nisi triste chaos :

Nam tua res propria est, lusu natura procaci
 Si quid abortivi degenerisve parit.
 Te vexare juvat morbis gravioribus ægros,
 Et quâ vix aderat spes, renovare metum.

Quodcunque in vitâ patimur, quodcunque timemus,
 Fit tibi ludibrium materiesque joci.
 Navita naufragium patitur, nova vulnera miles,
 Agricolæ pluviam pascua mersa dolent.

Mercatoris opes nimiam, bacchante procellâ,
 Oceani in tumidas ejiciuntur aquas.

Iratam haud meritò sponsam sibi plorat amator,
Iratum haud meritò mæsta puella procum.

Quod dicturus erat lapsum est de mente deserti
Causidici, et pleno stat sine voce foro.
Nec minùs infelix, jam ascendens pulpitem, hianti
Clericus amisit scripta legenda gregi ;
Aut ubi tempus adest, quum se vestire necesse est,
Candida non usquam est invenienda chlamys.

Sæpe reluctantem in præceps me impellere gaudes,
Tramite de recto vertere sæpe pedem ;
Et modò cum simules te promptam cedere, formas
Mille resistendi texere, mille dolos ;
Quòque magis trepidus labyrintho evadere conor,
Arctiùs astrictum me tua vincla tenent.

Fraude tuâ quoties factum est ut serus adessem
Cum gravis atque anceps res peragenda fuit ;
Aut vix sopitus clamarem, intrare fenestram
Latronem aspiciens, territus ‘ auxilium ! ’

Quin et falsa tuum est veris, et sacra profanis
Commiscere ; tuum fanda nefanda loqui.
Quid plura ? accedunt, duce te, rixæque minæque,
Atque odium, et pugnæ non cohibendus amor,
Et variæ pœnarum artes, quas esse sub Orco
Impositas culpis fabula prisca refert

Quod fatum ergo tibi fas est, Equa dira, precari,
Per noctem nobis quæ mala tanta paras ?
Sors tua in infernas sit præcipitarily undas,
Horrida quæ, somni nescia, monstra natant,

Et, dum indefessa rabie furiosa minantur,
Te fieri prædam nocte dieque suam,
Quantumvis nisu tentes tentesque perenni,
E Stygio nunquam surgere posse vado.

C. W.

Kilrymont, St. Andrews, e Cubiculo, Jan. 1891.

I was at first disinclined to attempt the difficult task of translating this poem ; but the enforced leisure of a sea-

voyage¹ has given me an opportunity, of which the unlearned reader shall have the benefit.

Night Mare

Woe to thee, beast! who mak'st the weary sigh,
Whose terrors drive sleep's solace from our bed,
Changing all shapes to shapeless fantasy,
Churning a chaos out of heart and head.

Thine are all sports of Nature's wantonness,
Her brood of foul abortion or decay.
Thou lov'st to vex the sick with new distress,
And dawning hope with fear to chase away.

Whate'er we suffer and whate'er we dread,
Are mirth and laughter to thy scornful mood.
The sailor drowns; the soldier falls half dead;
The farmer sees his pastures swept by flood.

The howling storm fulfils the merchant's fears,
And feeds the ocean with his hoarded gains.
The lover mourns his sweetheart's causeless tears;
The maiden of her lover's spite complains.

The lawyer's speech hangs voiceless in the air,
While the packed court expectant hems him in;
The parson, as he climbs the pulpit stair,
Has lost his sermon, while the people grin,
Or his white surplice seeks, and finds nowhere,
As the clock warns him service should begin.

Often thou hurl'st me headlong from a height,
Oft from the path my steps thy craft beguiles,
And, having made pretence of ready flight,
Thou turn'st upon me with a thousand wiles;
Or, panting as in narrow maze I fight,
My struggles fix me firmer in thy toils.

¹ From Alexandria to Marseilles, 5 November, 1898, returning from Jerusalem after the consecration of St. George's Church (18 Oct.).

Oft hast thou made me late with cruel art
 When some grave business needed instant care ;
 Oft at some window-entering thief I start
 From my first slumber, crying ' Help ! Who's there ? '

Thine too it is to mingle true with false,
 Profane with sacred ; things both right and wrong
 To utter ; in thy train are threats and brawls
 And hatred, and a love of fight too strong
 To brook control, nay every pain that mauls
 Poor souls (as story tells) in Pluto's throng.

What then, foul beast, should be my curse on thee,
 Who makest night so hideous, and so grim ?
 May'st thou be whelmèd in th' infernal sea,
 Where horrid sleepless monsters ever swim ;

And as they threaten with a ceaseless rage,
 And tear thee, day and night, yet never tire,
 Though thou should'st struggle upward age on age,
 May'st thou ne'er issue from the Stygian mire.

Of the Bishop's serious thoughts and religious studies in this period we have a much larger evidence in the two volumes of Latin verse of which one has already been mentioned in connection with Cardinal Newman. The other was a series of the Collects of the Book of Common Prayer, and certain select Psalms and Hymns translated into elegiacs and published by Murray in 1890. My uncle would probably have liked, throughout his earlier life, to have made Mr. Murray his publisher, but there had been a misunderstanding over the 'Greek Grammar,' which Dean Gaisford recommended should be transferred to the Delegates of the University Press ; and he was therefore grateful to Mr. Earl Hodgson for his intervention in regard to this little book, which, beautiful as it is, brought, I fear, little gain to either author or publisher.

Those who have the volume may be glad to add to it the

two Hymns that follow, which he printed (with *Equa Nocturna*) for private circulation, and the version of ‘Lead, kindly Light,’ which he had hardly finished, but which I have ventured to publish. He first rendered it into elegiacs, and then changed it into a metre more suggestive of the original, and more terse in its rendering of the singularly felicitous English, especially of the alternate lines.

The two Hymns here translated were, I believe, always — or, at least, regularly — used by the Bishop at Confirmations, of course in their English form.

‘*Our Blest Redeemer, ere He breathed*’

Hymns A. and M., No. 207.

Nos propter Dominus toleratâ morte, priusquàm
 Supremum ex tenero dixit amore vale,
 Consolatorem per testamenta ducemque,
 Qui nobis pro se vellet adesse, dedit.

Ille ultrò superâ venit novus hospes ab aulâ
 Spargere naturæ dulcîa dona suæ,
 Sicubi per terras inter mortalia corda
 Unum humile inveniat quâ se habitare juvet.

Illius quoque vox, quam sæpe audire solemus,
 Vespertina levi spirat ut aura sono,
 Omnem quæ cohibet culpam, mulcetque timorem,
 Et de cælesti mussat in aure domo.

Et si quam fuimus laudem virtutis adepti,
 Carnis et improbitas si qua subacta fuit,
 Et si quem veræ sensum pietatis habemus,
 Ille unus varii muneris auctor erat.

Spiritus, unde venit puri quodcunque bonique est,
 Quàm sumus infirmi respice, et affer opem;
 O! magis apta lubens ut in illis incola fias,
 Pectora fac renovans numine nostra tuo.

‘ *Thine for ever, God of Love* ’

Hymns A. and M. 280.

SEMPER amans et amande Deus, quæ poscimus audi,
 Maximus in solio quâ super astra sedes ;
 Cessemus nunquam—vel in hâc vel sorte futurâ,—
 Cessemus nunquam nos, Deus, esse tui.

Cessemus nunquam esse tui ; Tu, vindice dextrâ,
 Nos mala per vitæ qualiacunque juva :
 Tu via, tu verum, tu vita, O ! dirige gressus
 Fulgida quâ regnum lux sine nocte tenet.

Cessemus nunquam esse tui ; nam terque quaterque
 Felices in Te qui posuere fidem ;
 Salvator, custos, Idem cælestis amicus,
 Tutela ad finem sis quoque nostra, Deus !

Cessemus nunquam esse tui ; dilecte, paventem
 Nos, Pastor, serves invalidumque gregem ;
 Omnes ut, sine Te qui salvi haud possumus esse,
 Simus participes in bonitate tuâ.

Cessemus nunquam esse tui ; Tu ducere præsens,
 Tu quæ deficient suppeditare volens,
 Omnia Tu peccata ultrò delere paratus,
 Nos hinc ad superam denique tolle domum.

‘ *Lead, kindly Light* ’

Duc circumfusas inter, Lux alma, tenebras,
 Duc, age, me fessum timidumque.

Duc, age, nam fuscis tellurem amplectitur alis
 Nox alta, atque domo procul absum.

Dirige tu gressus ; longinqua haud cernere posco :
 Ire gradum mihi sufficit unum.

Non sum qualis eram, cum incertis passibus errans,
 Te non esse ducem cupiebam.

Deligere ipse viam mihimet scrutatus amabam,
 Sed nunc signa sequi tua quæro.

Cæcus amor mundi fastusque, ah ! non sine cura
 Urgebant : meminisse ea noli !

Huc usque incolumis, duce te, per cuncta tetendi,
 Spesque tui est eadem ducis ultra.
 Sit via per rupes, per stagna et tesqua, per undas,
 Dum cælo nox atra recessit;
 Et mane illa, olim dilecta et perditâ posthâc,
 Ora iterum mihi rident.

April 1891.

The following is an acknowledgment of the gift of the volume of *Collects* of more than usual interest on the part of a brother Bishop, who sympathised much with the Bishop of St. Andrews in many of his aspirations. It is dated 'Palace, Ripon, 12 April, 1890':

I owe you many apologies and many thanks. For pleasure and profit you have given me—thanks! For long delayed acknowledgment—apologies. First, your Latin translations of *Collects* and familiar songs of our Zion reached me safely. Thank you for so kindly guessing that I should value them. I do, and shall prize them. Secondly, the photograph of yourself, which, now in frame, makes a welcome addition to my small portrait gallery of honoured friends. For these thanks many indeed. I was touched by the preface to the Latin translations.¹ Will you accept the enclosed as my answer? Forgive its defects. It will at least show that I am not unmindful of your kindness or forgetful of our pleasant meeting at St. Andrews.

Ever yours gratefully,
 W. B. RIPON.

'Nec cithara carentem.'—HOR. *Od.* bk. i. 31.

'A SAD old age becomes his certain lot
 Who knows not whist.' So spake the wit of France,
 Deeming the mimic skill in games of chance
 Some solace in the years when joys are not.

Then who should murmur if the cultured mind,
 Which shed a holy light on Shakespeare's page,
 Should, after love's long labour, in its age
 In sanctities of song its respite find?

¹ Or, rather, dedication to the reader, referring to his enforced leisure from sickness, as an apology for time spent on such occupations.

Nay—wisely happy he sweet concord taught
 (Toiling where Holy Andrew's name endears
 His task), and in his riper age soars higher
 And turns to praise : though life with pain be fraught,
 His holy thoughts are 'wanting not the lyre,'
 But wake new music in declining years.

But it would be a mistake to suppose that other studies were absent. We have seen that the 'Annals' were largely composed in these last years, and other plans were projected, particularly for volumes of sermons, addresses, lectures, and reviews. One useful volume of sermons, 'The Primary Witness to the Truth of the Gospel,' was actually carried through the press, and published, with a dedication to the members of the congregations in the united Diocese, dated on the thirty-ninth anniversary of his consecration (25 January, 1892), and containing also his Charge of the previous autumn on 'Old Testament Criticism.' The other volumes projected were to be three in number :

I. A volume containing 'Occasional Sermons preached in Scotland and England.' 1. Four preached to St. Andrews students ; 2. Three addresses to students in other universities, one at Aberdeen and two in Edinburgh ; 3. Fasque sermon ('History of Glenalmond'), consecration of Chapel, Glenalmond, Special Synod, Enthroning at St. Ninian's ; 4. Glasgow Consecration (Barnabas and Luke), General Synod 1862, Consecration of [St. Ninian's] Cathedral, General Synod 1890, Dundee Anniversary (Philadelphia), Consecration of Newport, Comrie (?). 5. English sermons : Kidderminster, Norwich Musical Festival, St. Albans Musical Festival, Westminster Abbey (Gadara), Salisbury Cathedral (Daniel), Oxford (mending of nets), Oxford (Trinity Sunday), and [others not clearly specified], and those at Peterboro' and Chichester cathedrals.

II. A volume of 'Miscellaneous Sermons for all Seasons.'

III. 'Lectures and Reviews on subjects Secular and Sacred.'

i. 'Three great Orators of Antiquity,' Demosthenes, Cicero, St. John Chrysostom.

ii. 'Pindar and Athletics.'

iii. 'Shakespeare.' 1. Life. 2. Teaching.

iv. 'Requirements of St. Cyril's Interpretation.' 1. Humility; 2. Learning; 3. Stability.

v. *Reviews*. 1. 'Abp. Hamilton's Catechism'; 2. 'Lord Bute's Breviary'; 3. 'Eastern Patriarchs and the Pope'; 4. 'Luther and Foreign Protestants on Episcopacy.' 'Plea for Justice,' Duke of Argyll. 5. Lord Lindsay [on 'Essays and Reviews'].

vi. Names of days of the week. Coronation.

I trust that this latter volume at least may be published some day, and also a third volume of 'Public Appeals,' with an Index.

6. *Manner of Preaching and Confirming*

The Bishop's manner and method of preaching and teaching has been incidentally, as well as directly, illustrated in many parts of this volume. As a catechist he was specially happy and impressive, and both in this duty and in sermons and addresses he had a great hold upon the young. I had not often the advantage of hearing him preach, but there is no doubt that the effect of his delivery was very great, from the intensity of his conviction, the simplicity of his faith, the seriousness and grandeur of the issues set before the audience, the clearness of his style, the natural dignity of his manner, and the beauty and correct emphasis of his enunciation. Dr. Danson criticised the sermons, and no doubt with some justice, as *too* lucid, and, consequently, as leaving too little to the intellect and imagination of the hearer, and as failing to touch the deeper springs of human feeling. It must indeed be acknowledged that the poetical suggestiveness, which charms us in such a strange way in Newman, is absent; that the felicity of elaboration and the delicacy

of thought which delight us in Dean Church, and the sense of masterful grasp of new and weighty ideas which holds us in James Mozley, not to speak of the technical skill of more rhetorical preachers, are equally deficient. But there are too many testimonies to the effectiveness of his preaching to permit any one to doubt the fact that it was much greater than might be gathered from the mere reading in private of the written words. I will give one from Canon Farquhar's 'Funeral Sermon' which was specially appropriate as delivered at St. Ninian's.

Who that ever heard him preach can forget his Sermons? These were as far removed as it is possible to conceive from the slipshod rambling rhetoric that now so often passes as eloquence. True, the Bishop's discourses were not addressed to those who refused to listen, but as for those who did listen, how he used to thrill them, with his beautiful, classic, English, his complete logical arrangement, his exquisite taste, his fine sonorous voice, his wealth of instruction, his massive good sense, his intellectual force, his intense earnestness and his awakening power!

A reflection on the Bishop's effectiveness as a preacher may be a comfort to those clergy who preach from manuscript: for my uncle *never* preached without book, and on one occasion was strangely discomposed because of the accidental absence of his copy. He actually put off the Confirmation for half an hour, and had begun to write an address, when he recollected that his clerical host had one of his printed Confirmation Addresses (his own gift) in his study, which set him at ease, and, with a few fresh touches, took the place of the lost manuscript.

His manner of confirming was peculiarly solemn and impressive, and he was particular not to interrupt the service by addresses or hymns. His rule (writes one of his daughters) was to have it prefaced by the Litany, if the Litany had not been already said. Then followed Hymn

207 (A. and M.), 'Our Blest Redeemer,' then the Address, then Hymn 157, 'Come, Holy Ghost,' or 209, 'Come, gracious Spirit,' and then the whole Order of Confirmation to its close. He usually confirmed standing, and generally said the blessing separately for each person. Then followed Hymn 280, 'Thine for Ever,' and then a general blessing for the congregation. He was always anxious to have a congregation of interested persons intelligently following, as well as the candidates.

It may interest Scotsmen to be told that he used the Edinburgh D.D. hood (purple and black) for Lent, and the St. Andrews (purple and white) for Advent. Each of them, to him, was a perpetual symbol of the possibilities of Reunion.

After the Confirmation the Bishop distributed cards or certificates bearing his signature. The card had certain appropriate texts (Ps. lxxvi. 11 and Ps. xxvii. 16) and prayers, and his questions and answers intended as an Appendix to the Catechism. A copy of it is among the documents printed at the end of this volume (p. 357).

He required not only to have the names and ages, but some description of the class to which the candidates belonged, sent to him on a list *before* the time of Confirmation. His last Confirmations were held at Newport—chiefly, as usual, for boys of the *Mars* training-ship—and at Pittenweem, shortly before Easter in the year of his death.

In these public services of the Church, even to the end, all lassitude and languor was thrown off, and the old man acquired a picturesque beauty and a commanding vigour which struck those, who had lately seen his weakness, with astonishment, and even with awe.

7. *Lord Selborne's Character of Bishop Wordsworth and the Bishop's Comments*

The following judgment of his friend's character from the pen of Lord Selborne will be read with interest by those who are not already familiar with it. See his 'Family and Personal Memorials,' i. chap. viii. 127-8 (Lond. 1896).

He was a man of impetuous feelings and great energy, but liable (partly from physical causes, for his health always suffered from anxiety or excessive exertion) to alternations of lassitude and depression. Whatever he set his hand to do, he did it with his might. If book-learning, he made himself thoroughly master of it; if teaching, he spared no pains to inform, raise, and stimulate the hearts and minds of his scholars; if government, he was lavish of his strength, and of his means also, for the advancement of the work in hand; if controversy, he put on his armour in right earnest, and girded himself to the battle without favour or fear. His intellectual temper was eager and anxious, even to restlessness; and in conversation about serious matters he was sometimes too argumentative for his own or other people's comfort. He had an ardent zeal for truth, from which no attachment to party, no respect of persons could turn him aside. If his health had been better and his temperament less sensitive, if he had husbanded his strength more, and had been less willing to spend and be spent; if he had been less self-sacrificing and single-minded, and had lived more in the world and less in his library, he must have done greater things than it was his lot to do.

The Bishop gladly received the book in which these words first appeared, as a gift from his old friend, all the more valued because of its character as a privately printed volume intended only for family use.¹ The following letter is so full of interest that I print it in its entirety.

¹ The main part of it has since been published; but the two books differ, I believe, considerably.

To Lord Selborne

6 November, 1891.

I have now finished the book (Memorials), and I thank you most sincerely, first for the mark of confidence and affection which the gift implies, and then for the gift itself. I hardly know how to begin in speaking of it. Perhaps what struck me most has been the unusual amount of blessing which you appear to have enjoyed in the character of the various members of your own family, and also of that of your Wife.

Next to your Father, I was naturally most interested in your brother William; but I am not sure that you tell much more about him than I knew—or fancied that I knew—before. His mind was a Gordian knot which no one could untie, and I think he himself all but cut it rather than untied it. His views took too wide a range to be brought within the practical scope of individual endeavour; but though he was ever striving after an ideal beyond his reach, he was careful and conscientious about the duties of everyday life, and with his head in the clouds did not neglect τὰ ἐν ποσὶ. ‘Ingrediturque solo,’ &c. [*Æn.* iv. 177]. Had he lived in days of old, he would have made a splendid Stoic, another Seneca, but without his hollowness and inconsistency. Newman kindly sent me a copy of his Russian Journal, which I read with great interest, and I suppose I am almost the only person who ever read through the thick, closely-printed volume of his appeal to our Scottish Church. All through your volume it has been a pleasure to me to mark the instances in which there has been (sometimes quite unexpectedly) a striking resemblance between the views and sentiments you express, especially upon religious and ecclesiastical matters, and those which I have been holding, though, during many years, there has been so little personal intercourse between us: a resemblance which has sometimes extended to actual experiences. If Horace could write to Mæcenas ‘Utrumque nostrum,’ &c., merely because one had recovered from a serious illness, and the other had escaped being killed by the fall of a tree about the same time, I have much more reason to write the same to you who have been on several accounts a Mæcenas to me such as no one else has been, unless I am to except dear W. K. Hamilton. Whether Persius

had better reason for adopting the same sentiment and applying it, as he does, to Cornutus [*Sat.* v. 45, 46, 51]

Non equidem hoc dubites amborum fœdere certo
Consentire dies, et ab uno sidere duci :

Nescio quod certe est quod me tibi temperat astrum,

we cannot tell. Let me mention some of the resemblances.

1. You lost your Uncle Edward, Captain of the 'Nautilus,' ætat. twenty-six in 1807. I lost my Uncle John, Captain of the 'Abergavenny,' ætat. thirty-three, in 1805, and besides their untimely fate there seems to have been much in common between their characters.

2. I have before referred to the striking similarity, in many respects, between the opinions entertained and the line adopted by our two Fathers; they would have concurred thoroughly with Rose in condemning as unwise the publication of Froude's 'Remains'; with him they had more delight in contemplating wherein we all agree than in moving controversy (p. 171); they both understood and taught that 'the Fathers were to be read with caution' (p. 132). They would quite have agreed about Tract 90 as 'indiscreet and unsatisfactory' enough (p. 198). Altogether your memorial to your father is a noble and beautiful monument of filial love and duty, and it is a happy circumstance that you are able to crown it with the testimony of so good and competent a judge as Burgon.

3. But to come to yourself and your own opinions. At p. 260 the estimate which you give of Keble is precisely that which I have formed, and so too of Pusey. 'He was not a strong leader,' as I shall have occasion to show, if I am spared to publish my second volume. At p. 295, where you describe Dr. Yonge's opinions, you exactly represent mine as well as your own, and again more fully at p. 358, and again in your address of 10 March, 1852, p. 401. So, too, on the Gorham Judgment; I took, in our Diocesan Synod, precisely the line which you recommend (p. 356), and was thanked by Bishop Phillpotts for it.

It is a great bathos to descend to a personal peculiarity such as *smoking*; but your 'experiment' at Winchester had been anticipated at Harrow. Although I have always been quite *tolerant* of smoking in others, I have always 'failed' in forming a habit of it for myself, which I rather regret, because, fortified

with such an example as Barrow, I think I might, at times, have derived comfort from it.

In 1846 we were both travelling in Italy, and visiting Rome for the first time—only you were two months earlier. You had the advantage over me in the North, for you saw Milan, &c., which I missed; and I had the advantage over you in the South, for I saw Naples, Pompeii, and Pæstum, which you do not seem to have reached.

And now, before I conclude, to refer, for a moment, to what you are so good as to say of me at pp. 83–6. What there is of praise is far too lavish; what there is of gently hinted disapproval is far too lenient. I pass by the former ‘*oculo irretorto*’ (knowing how little it is deserved, and how much in your friendly retrospect distance of time had lent enchantment to the view) to note the accuracy of the latter—except in one respect. It seems, I think, to imply that my friends regard me, and that I ought to regard myself, as a disappointed man. But to this I must demur. I was physically disqualified (as indeed you intimate) for a post of greater labour, or heavier responsibility and anxiety than that which I have filled. If I had ever had the offer of an English Bishopric, I *believe* I should have refused it. I am *quite sure* that I ought to have done so; with my eager temperament (which you also recognise) I should have broken down under it—much sooner than my brother did, or than Claughton has done, both of whom had constitutions better than mine. Happily, too, I was not ambitious, and, knowing well my manifold defects, have *never* desired more than I have obtained. My office in this country has afforded me ample (and upon the whole pleasurable) scope for the exercise of my energies, without exhausting them, and I have abundant reason to believe (if I may trust assurances from a variety of quarters) that I have been permitted to do some good, by bringing people’s minds to see the evil and sinfulness of Ecclesiastical divisions, and to long for a better state of things, though unable as yet to see their way to its accomplishment. Meanwhile I have quite outlived the opposition which at first the assertion of sound Church principles naturally roused; and in my own Diocese, whereas I received it from my predecessor steeped in the worst animosities of party spirit, all is now peace and mutual good will. In short, God’s Providence has dealt most mercifully with me, and I could not have chosen for myself so well as He has all along graciously

chosen for me. The sphere in which I have been placed has been exactly suited for me. My Winchester fellowship (thanks mainly to you¹) has supplied what was wanting for the sufficient maintenance of my wife and family, and I must beg you to think that if I have failed (as doubtless I have) to do all the good that I might have done, the failure is due, not to lack of opportunities, which have been placed abundantly within my reach, but to my own short-comings. Your book would have been finished and this letter would have been written *sooner*, but since colder weather has set in I have been sadly troubled again with my old enemy, eczema, which laid me up for six months, two years ago, and seems inclined, I fear, to repeat the visitation. I have made a memorandum that the book is to go to my daughter Charlotte's hands, in strict confidence, at my death.

8. *Conclusion*

I have now come to the end of my task, which I finish on the eve of my departure for Jerusalem in October 1898. A sufficiently long time has elapsed to make it easier to speak on some of the more delicate and debatable points than it would have been even five years ago. I rise from its completion with much thankfulness for the privilege of looking so closely into the records of a noble life, and with a prayer that those who read this summary of them may grow stronger in their faith in God's Providence, and more determined to use their own opportunities, with diligence, for the well-being of His Church.

OSMINGTON, 30 *September*, 1898.

¹ The fellowship was vacant through the resignation of Bishop George Moberly, who desired that my uncle should succeed him. There was some hesitation on the part of the Warden and Fellows as to whether they might claim to fill up the vacancy, and whether they *could* elect my uncle, who was not, technically, a Wykehamist. Further, new statutes had been framed and a new governing body named. Roundell Palmer throughout strongly urged my uncle's claims and encouraged the Warden and Fellows to elect, which they did on 9 May, 1871. The new statutes came into operation 28 July of the same year. Cp. p. 32 n.

CONTENTS OF THE APPENDICES

	PAGE
I. ON BISHOP TORRY'S PRAYER BOOK	345
II. PASTORAL LETTER ISSUED BY THE EPISCOPAL SYNOD (27 MAY, 1858)	349
III. SUGGESTED ADDITION TO CHURCH CATECHISM—	
(A) INTRODUCTORY REMARKS (1878)	353
(B) CONFIRMATION CARD	357
IV. REMARKS ON THE ARCHBISHOP'S JUDGMENT (1890)	360
V. THE WAVERLEY NOVELS ARRANGED CHRONOLOGICALLY	362
VI. THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1888 AND HOME REUNION. LETTER FROM BISHOP BARRY	363
VII. LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL PRINTED WRITINGS OF CHARLES WORDSWORTH IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER	366
VIII. CHURCHES AND PARSONAGES BUILT DURING HIS EPISCOPATE	386
IX. THE BISHOP'S FAMILY	388

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

(Referring to pp. 10-15)

ON BISHOP TORRY'S PRAYER BOOK

It may be interesting to the reader, as Bishop Torry's Prayer Book is now very scarce, to be told what were the principal differences which it presented when compared with the English Prayer Book and the other Offices from which it was drawn.

The Calendar had sixteen additional saints, of course mostly Scottish, taken from that prefixed to the book of 1637.¹

Permission was given to parents to become sponsors for their children at Baptism, which was and, under certain conditions, still is the rule of the Scottish Canons;² and the Apostolic Benediction was provided for use at the conclusion when Baptism was administered apart from Divine service. In Confirmation the following formula was provided, which is still in use under Canon XL. of 1890:³ 'I sign thee with the Sign of the

¹ These were SS. David, January 11; Mungo, January 13; Colman, February 18; Constantine, March 11; Patrick, March 17; Cyril, March 18; Cuthbert, March 20; Gilbert, April 1; Serf, April 20; Columba, June 9; Palladius, July 6; Ninian, September 16; Adamnan, September 20; Margaret, November 16; Ode V., November 27; Drostane, December 4.

² See the XVIIth Canon of 1838 and the XXXVIIIth of 1890. The latter has, section 2, 'In default of others the parents of the child may be admitted as Godfathers and Godmothers, and in cases of necessity, of which the clergyman shall be judge, one sponsor shall be deemed sufficient.'

³ As by the present Bishop (Wilkinson) of St. Andrews, whom I saw confirm at Muthill on 29 August, 1895, and by the Bishop (Dowden) of Edinburgh, who has sanctioned a form containing it published by the St. Giles' Printing Co., York Place, Edinburgh. The late Bishop of St. Andrews dropped it in 1862-63, after the General Synod of that date which adopted the English Prayer-book—one of the points which much distressed Mr. George Forbes.

Cross; and I lay mine hands upon thee, in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Defend, O Lord, this Thy child [or this Thy servant]' &c.

The Office for the Communion of the Sick made provision for the use of the reserved Sacrament, which is also directed in the rubrics at the end of the Communion Office itself.¹

It was, however, in the 'Office for the Holy Communion' that the greatest freedom was taken and the greatest offence given. It is printed by Dr. Neale as an appendix to his 'Life of Bishop Torry,' in a very convenient manner, side by side with three others, from which and from traditional usage it was drawn. These three he calls 'Laud's' (1637), 'Nonjurors,' and 'Received Scottish Office.' It differed from the 'Received S. O.' in several points, one of the most obvious being the printing of the earlier part of the service² with rubrics, partly new and partly old. The first of these rubrics, though it might have much to be said in its favour, was too important to be introduced with so little authority. It runs thus:

So many as intend to be partakers of the Holy Communion shall signify their names to the Curate at least some time the day before,

¹ *The Priest shall reserve so much of the consecrated gifts as may be required for the Communion of the Sick and others who could not be present at the Celebration in Church; and when he administers to them he shall proceed as directed in the Office for the Communion of the Sick.* This practice was no doubt adopted from the Nonjurors' Office of 1718, for which see Bishop Dowden *The Annotated Scottish Communion Office*, p. 321, Edinburgh, 1884. Bishop Jolly used to reserve for himself for Communion on Sundays and Festivals, as he only celebrated publicly five times a year (see his *Life* by Rev. W. Walker, p. 57, quoted by Bishop Dowden, *ib.* p. 328). I find the following rubric at the end of the *Communion Office of the Church of Scotland* bound up with an ordinary cheap modern English Prayer Book, and having the imprint of Alex. Murray, Church Bookseller, Aberdeen: *According to a venerable custom of the Church of Scotland, the Priest may reserve so much of the consecrated gifts as may be required for the Communion of the Sick, and others who could not be present at the Celebration in Church.* No rubrics, however, are found at the end of the Office in Bishop Falconar's text of 1764, which Bishop Dowden has reprinted as the one possessed of most authority. There is, however, no definitely authorised book.

² Up to 1844 this had never appeared in print, the 'wee bookies' and other forms beginning with the Exhortation. The edition of 1844 is a handsome black-letter quarto, published in London by Burns, but the text (says Dowden, p. 277) is unfortunately not satisfactory.

that he may ascertain that they believe all the Articles of the Catholic Faith, and are free from deadly sin, or if not, that they are truly penitent for it; and in the case of strangers, that they have been baptised and confirmed, and are regular Communicants of the Church.

The next rubric refers to the case of a notorious evil-liver, and introduces the condition of receiving absolution before such a one may come to the Lord's Table.

The use of the term 'Altar' in various parts of these rubrics could hardly be objected to by any one in Scotland, since it occurs—though only once—in the rubrics of the 'Received S. O.' The following rubric is of some interest, as showing the position which Bishop Torry probably took at the Altar at the beginning of the service :

The Altar, when the Holy Eucharist is to be celebrated, shall have a fair white linen cloth upon it, and the Priest, standing at the north side thereof, shall say the Lord's Prayer, &c.

The alternative use of the 'Summary of the Law' for the Ten Commandments, and of the Collect 'O Almighty Lord and everlasting God, we beseech Thee to direct, sanctify, and govern, &c.' for the prayer for the Sovereign, is no doubt according to Scottish usage; so also are the response 'Glory be to Thee, O God' (not then 'O Lord'),¹ before the Gospel, and the words of the Priest, 'Here endeth the Holy Gospel,' and the response 'Thanks be to Thee, O Lord, for this Thy glorious Gospel,' after it.

A rubric was introduced from the English Office requiring the curate to give notice of Holy Days, &c., but curiously enough the publication of the Banns of Matrimony in this place, which had been rightly preserved by the Nonjurors, was dropped in accordance with the common English printers' mistake.

More remarkable still was the order for the dismissal of non-Communicants which represented Bishop Torry's own very strong opinion, and the practice of the Nonjurors, but had never found a place before, as far as I know, in any printed Office,

¹ So it is in Canon XXIX. of 1838, and so continued in later editions of the Canon *Of the due care of Churches; of reverent Behaviour and Attention in time of Divine service.* But in the revision of 1890 the form prescribed is, what I believe is more correct, 'Glory be to thee, O Lord'—more correct as more definitely addressed to our Saviour, who is speaking to us in the Gospel.

and was contrary to the feelings and practice of his own friends in the Cathedral of St. Ninian's. This is as follows :

Then shall follow the sermon: and when the Holy Eucharist is to be celebrated, the Minister shall dismiss the non-Communicants in these or like words: 'Let those who are not to Communicate now depart.'

In the remainder of the Office itself there are few, if any,¹ deviations from the 'Received S. O.' except the omission of the *Amen* after the words of Institution in the Consecration Prayer, and the changed order 'preserve thy body and soul'—following the English and Aberdeen use—instead of the Scottish 'thy soul and body.'²

But the rubrics at the end were also open to much comment. That about frequency of Communion prescribed that the Holy Communion shall be celebrated so often and at such times that every member of the Church of Scotland 'come to a proper time of life, may communicate at least three times in the year, whereof the Feast of Easter or of Pentecost or of Christmas shall be one,' thus dethroning Easter from its acknowledged supremacy. That about the elements was remarkable on both sides as making no reference whatever 'to wafers or wafer bread,'³ and as naming the custom of mixing 'a little pure and clean Water with the Wine in the Eucharistic Cup, when the same is taken from the Prothesis or Credence to be presented upon the Altar.'

Another gave permission for a celebration to take place in cases of necessity with only one Communicant besides the Priest. That for reservation has already been noticed. The last but one is as follows :

It is customary for the Communicants in this Church to receive the Sacrament of our LORD'S Body upon the palm of the right hand,

¹ The omission of the words in the short Exhortation before the Confession 'meekly kneeling upon your knees,' noticed by Neale, is not really an omission. They do not appear in Bishop Falconar's text, and indeed are not in place, as the people are already kneeling. They appear in Skinner's Aberdeen copy of 1807.

² See Bishop Dowden *ut supra*, p. 278. Neale does not notice this, as he seems to have followed Skinner's Aberdeen copy of the R. S. O.

³ 'The best and purcest wheaten bread that conveniently may be gotten shall be used (not it shall suffice, &c.) for the Holy Communion.' The words 'such as is usual to be eaten' do not, however, appear.

crossed over the left, and thus reverently raise It to the mouth, so as not to let the smallest Particle fall to the ground.

The last provides for the omission of one of the exhortations when there is not a celebration.

APPENDIX II

(See pp. 108–113)

COPY OF THE PASTORAL LETTER ISSUED BY THE EPISCOPAL SYNOD

*To all faithful Members of the Church in Scotland, the Bishops,
in Synod assembled, send greeting :—*

BRETHREN BELOVED IN THE LORD,—

IT must be only too well known to you all that a Charge delivered to his Clergy, in the month of August last year, by our Right Reverend Brother the BISHOP OF BRECHIN, and afterwards published by him, has called forth much opposition, and given rise, in an unusual degree, to anxiety and alarm. Our notice was drawn to the publication by two of our Body, at our ordinary Synod in September last; and again, when we met for special purposes in December, the same subject was brought before us more formally. Unfortunately we were not then all present; and such being the case, and there being a difference of opinion amongst us as to the course which it would be most expedient to pursue in so grave a matter, it was ultimately resolved to postpone the determination of it till our next ordinary Synod. At the same time, it is right you should be informed that there was but one feeling and one opinion expressed by those who were present, as there is now but one opinion entertained by us all (except the Bishop of Brechin), in regard to the publication itself. We unanimously regret that such a Charge should have been delivered and put forth by one of our Body. We regret it on other accounts, and because it forces upon us the painful duty of making known that we do not concur with our Right Reverend Brother in the views he has expressed on so material a point as the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. We think those views, in

the extent in which he has defined and urged them, unsound, erroneous, and calculated to lead, if not resolutely opposed, to still graver error. The case may not amount to a direct call for a formal presentment of the Bishop, as liable to judicial penalties; and no such formal presentment has been lodged before us. But the publication of such views in a document for the guidance of Clergy, and, still more, the republication of the Charge 'in its integrity,' notwithstanding the grave remonstrances with which it had been met, and the scandal which it had raised—this, attended by the avowed confidence of the author in the eventual 'triumph of his teaching' (Preface, p. 6), leaves us, we feel, no alternative but to declare our own dissent, and to caution you against being led astray either by the teaching itself, or by the undue confidence with which it is maintained.

At the same time, however, let it be clearly understood, that we cordially concur with our Brother in his desire to protect the most holy ordinance of our religion from all irreverence, and to impress upon the hearts of all men a deep, faithful, thankful conviction of its unspeakable blessedness. It is not on account of any variance between us as to the importance of these duties, but for the attempt which he has made to rest them upon a false foundation, that we feel we have cause to differ from him. We cannot forget that the aversion to the doctrine of Sacramental Grace, and even its entire rejection, unhappily prevalent in many quarters since the time of the Reformation, is to be regarded as the natural reaction from excesses with which the Primitive teaching had been overlaid; and we have learnt abundantly, both from history and experience, that the violence of such reaction, instead of gradually diminishing, is liable to be renewed and aggravated whenever it is attempted to restore those excesses. This, we believe, is the fundamental error into which our Brother has fallen. Anxious to assert and uphold the grace, the dignity, and efficacy of the blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, he has adopted a line of argument which, as it exceeds the truth of God's holy Word, so it is calculated, we are sure, by no slow or uncertain process, to defeat that very end. He has pleaded for what has recently been called 'the Real Objective Presence,' in such a manner, that the inferences which he draws from it, however doctrinally unsound, become, as he represents, logically inevitable; that is, Supreme Adoration becomes due to Christ,

as mysteriously present in the gifts (p. 27), or, as it is expressed elsewhere, 'to Christ in the gifts' (pp. 28, 33); and the Sacrifice of the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Altar become 'substantially one,' and 'in some transcendental sense identical' (p. 42).

Convinced, as we are, that neither of these conclusions is to be found in Holy Scripture, or has been deduced therefrom by the Church; and persuaded that the teaching of them has given rise to corruptions and superstitions, from which we have been set free through the blessing of God vouchsafed to the wisdom and courage of our forefathers; we feel it our duty to resist the attempt which has been made to press these conclusions upon your acceptance, and we earnestly entreat you not to suffer yourselves to be disturbed or misguided by it. After due consideration, we do not hesitate to say, that the reasoning by which they are maintained is, in our opinion, fallacious; and that the testimony of authorities produced in their support, when fully and carefully examined, will generally be found not to justify the use to which it has been applied.

More particularly, we feel called on, at this season of trial, to exhort you, our dear brethren of the Clergy, that you be not moved under the excitement that prevails around us, so as either to exceed or fall short in your teaching of the Truth with respect to the doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament which has thus unhappily been brought into controversy.

1. Instructed by Scripture and the Formularies of the Church, you will continue to teach that the consecrated elements of Bread and Wine become, in a Mystery, the Body and Blood of Christ; for purposes of grace to all who receive them worthily, and for condemnation to those who receive the same unworthily. But you will not, we trust, attempt to define more nearly the mode of this mysterious Presence. You will remember that, as our Church has repudiated the doctrine of Transubstantiation, so she has given us no authority whereby we can require it to be believed that the substance of Christ's Body and Blood, still less His entire Person as God and Man, now glorified in the Heavens, is made to exist *with, in, or under* the material substances of Bread and Wine.

2. You will continue to teach that this Sacrifice of the Altar is to be regarded no otherwise than as the means whereby we represent, commemorate, and plead, with praise and thanks-

giving, before God, the unspeakable merits of the precious death of Christ; and whereby He communicates and applies to our souls all the benefits of that one full and all-sufficient Sacrifice once made upon the Cross.

3. You will continue to teach that the consecrated elements, being the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, are to be received with lowly veneration and devout thankfulness. And inasmuch as doubts have been raised with regard to the true interpretation of the Rubric affixed to the Communion Office in the Book of Common Prayer, we desire to remind you of a Canon which was passed by the Convocations of both Provinces of the Church of England in 1640, and which we are satisfied to accept meanwhile for our own guidance in determining the sense of the aforesaid Rubric, the matter not having been ruled by a General Synod of our own Church. According to that Canon, it was resolved that gestures of adoration, in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, are to be performed 'not upon any opinion of a corporal Presence of the Body of Jesus Christ on the Holy Table, or in mystical elements, but only for the advancement of God's Majesty, and to give Him alone that honour and glory that is due to Him, and no otherwise.'¹

These words of fatherly guidance and admonition, in a time of trouble and offence, we claim to offer to you all by a right essentially inherent in a Provincial Episcopate²—a right which was constantly exercised by the Bishops of the Primitive Church. Whenever in the exercise of this right, or rather in the performance of this duty, they had occasion to animadvert upon the teaching of one of their own Body, doubtless they would feel their position of responsibility doubly difficult and painful. And the same, most assuredly, has been felt by us. We would gladly—most gladly—have avoided the course now taken, if we could have done so consistently with the solemn obligations under which we lie towards you all, and not least towards our Brother himself.

The reluctance we have shown to adopt any Synodical action in this case, and the calls we have made upon our Brother, both

¹ Can. vii.; see Laud's *Works*, v. 626; Cardw. *Synod*, i. 406.

² See Apos. Can. xxxvi.; Nicene Can. v.; *Synod of Antioch*, can. xx; and in our own Code can. xxxvi., compared with canons ii., xxxii., xxxvi. [The last numeral should probably be xxxviii. on the issue of a Pastoral Letter by Episcopal Synod.]

privately and in Synod, and the opportunities we have given him, to reconsider what he has written, are a proof of this. But tracing, as we plainly do, in the teaching of this Charge, a tendency to undermine the great foundations upon which our Formularies rest, and to weaken our sense of gratitude and respect towards the holy men from whom we have derived them in their present state; and seeing also, on his part, an apparent determination not to surrender the position he has taken up—we have felt ourselves constrained to deal with the matter as we have now done. For this purpose we have assembled in special Synod, which a due regard to the peace and security of the Church appeared to us to require. We earnestly entreat you to join with us in prayer, that the issue of our anxious and solemn deliberations may be blessed to the restoration of mutual confidence and harmony, and to the avoiding of all causes of dissension and offence for the time to come.

Grace be with you, Brethren, and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

C. H. TERROT, Bishop of Edinburgh, and Primus.
 ALEXANDER EWING, Bishop of Argyll and the Isles,
 W. J. TROWER, Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway.
 ROBERT EDEN, Bishop of Moray and Ross.
 CHARLES WORDSWORTH, Bishop of St. Andrews,
 Dunkeld, and Dunblane.
 THOMAS GEORGE SUTHER, Bishop of Aberdeen.

EDINBURGH, *May 27, 1858.*

APPENDIX III

(*See page 224*)

SUGGESTED ADDITION TO CHURCH CATECHISM, AND CONFIRMATION CARD

A.

Introductory Remarks (1878)

It will be remembered by those who were present at the former Lambeth Conference (1867) that the proceedings of the final session were brought to a close somewhat abruptly, from want

of sufficient time, combined with the fact that an engagement had been made by the Archbishop and many of the Bishops to be present at a meeting of the S.P.G. fixed for that afternoon. Had this been otherwise, I had obtained permission from His Grace the President to bring forward a proposal which I had previously mentioned not only to him, but to several other of the leading members of the Conference, e.g. the then Bishops of Winchester (Sumner), of Oxford (Wilberforce), of Ohio (M'Ilvaine), and of Salisbury (Hamilton)—and had so far secured their concurrence, that they recognised the importance of the matter, and gave me reason to expect their approval and support. As it was, not a moment could be found for consideration of the subject, and it fell through.

My proposal was to have been to this effect:—That a committee should be appointed to draw up a short addition to the Church Catechism, upon points which we must all recognise as *desiderata* in our present formula, especially *the Ministry of the Church and Confirmation*. It is well known that the Catechism, as put forth in our first Reformed Prayer Books, went no further than to the Question and Answer immediately following the Lord's Prayer; and that it was not till more than fifty years afterwards, viz. in 1604, that the section concerning the Sacraments with which it now concludes was added, having been drawn up by Dr. (afterwards Bishop) Overall, then Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation and Dean of St. Paul's. It may, I think, be supposed not unreasonably that the lax views in respect to the Sacraments, and still more to other ordinances, which had grown up in the meantime, and prevailed so generally among the Puritans, were due in great measure to the defect of authorised catechetical teaching concerning them during that long interval. And to what are we to attribute the similar laxity which still so commonly prevails amongst us with respect to the nature and obligation of the Threefold Ministry, and of the ordinance of Confirmation? It may be safe, I think, to answer that the same defect of authorised catechetical teaching concerning them leads very many to infer that our Church (having justly repudiated them in her 25th Article, as 'Sacraments of the Gospel' in the highest sense) does not regard them as of much or distinct importance. And yet it is idle to expect that the question of Catholic unity, as held by our Reformed Churches,

will ever be understood and appreciated until those matters, *which constitute the very bond of formal visible union*, have obtained their proper affirmative (and not merely negative) place in our Church's teaching, and are duly received and observed by all our members.

We are all familiar with the remark, so frequently repeated—and I remember it was made again by one of our American brethren in the first session of our present Conference (and since this paper was drawn up I have seen it also reported in the *Times* as proceeding from a Colonial Bishop at the Clerical Conference held at St. Paul's), that, whereas the members of other religious bodies, such as Roman Catholics on the one hand, and various Nonconformists on the other, are generally found to be well instructed in the distinctive tenets of the community to which they belong, it is not so, for the most part, with our own members. On the contrary, they are too often lamentably ignorant in regard to the principles with which, as professing to belong to our truly Catholic and truly Reformed Churches, they ought to be conversant; and so, if they do not actually fall away under the seductive influences to which they may be exposed on the right hand or on the left, they prove themselves very feeble, very indifferent, or it may be even very mischievous supporters of the cause, which, if better informed, they might have been both able and willing to maintain with good effect.

With regard to the Questions and Answers which I have drawn up, and which I venture to submit herewith, in order to show more clearly the nature and extent of the addition which my proposal contemplates, I wish it to be understood that, being merely an experimental draft, they may be superseded at once by any other, which, having the same objects in view, is likely to meet with more approval. The necessity for some such 'Addition' has been suggested by my own long experience in Scotland, where 'Episcopalians' are scarcely more than 2 per cent. of the entire Christian population; while in the American United States they are, I believe, about 5 or 6 per cent. I am quite aware that the experience of other Bishops, under different circumstances, might lead them to prefer the use of bolder and more sharply-defined language, and also to include a wider range of topics. For my own part, I have thought that a readier acceptance of the Truth which we hold, and are bound to teach, might be looked for not

only among our own people, but also among those who are without, provided only that we abstain as much as possible from the introduction of matters calculated to raise dispute even among ourselves, and provided we adhere to the calm and temperate tone which distinguishes the Book of Common Prayer.

It might also be considered whether an alternative Question and Answer should not be added at the beginning of the Confirmation Office (after the Preface), suited to meet the case of those (very numerous in Scotland, and probably also in America) who, having been baptised outside our Churches, have had no 'Godfathers or Godmothers.'

I need scarcely say that nothing more is sought for by the proposal now made than such a recognition and approval of the 'Addition,' whatever form it may assume, as might lead to its adoption with greater confidence in all cases where Bishops and Clergy are disposed to recommend it, and to cause it to be printed for general use.

I have only to add that the state of my health prevented me from being present at Lambeth after the first day's session; otherwise I should have spoken upon the subject, in connection, probably, with the discussion held upon the last day—'On the *condition, progress, and needs* of the various branches of the Anglican Communion.' We must all, I think, have felt the *need* of some such measure as that which I have suggested; and there are few of us, I believe, especially in the Colonies, in America, and in Scotland, who would not regard the adoption of such a measure, if wisely executed, as calculated to improve the *condition* and promote the *progress* of our respective Churches, if not in the present, in future generations.

July 16, 1878.

THE foregoing remarks, together with the 'Suggested Addition,' &c., were submitted, through the Bishop of Edinburgh, to the Chairmen of two of the Committees, and though received not unfavourably at least by one of them, and supported by the Bishop himself (our Secretary of Committees), I was informed that room could not be found for the introduction of the subject into either of the reports—partly, perhaps, because it had not been mentioned at the proper time; and, consequently, I resolved that it would not be desirable to attempt to bring it up at the

concluding sessions of the Conference. At the same time, the encouragement I have met with from more than one highly influential quarter has induced me to think that I ought not to allow the matter to drop altogether. I have, therefore, caused the 'Remarks,' &c., to be printed, in order that they may be sent to each of the members of our Home Episcopate, and, if received with sufficient favour by my brethren of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, I shall probably take some step with a view to the adoption of the 'Suggested Addition,' more or less formally, in the first instance among ourselves, as advised by an English Bishop.

Bishopshall, St. Andrews, August 1878.

[Then follow the Questions and Answers nearly as below, p. 358.]

B.

CONFIRMATION CARD

Promise unto the Lord your God, and keep it.

At

IN THE DIOCESE OF ST. ANDREWS, &C.

.....
 WAS CONFIRMED

On

.....
 Bishop.

.....
 Rector.

Be strong and He shall comfort thine heart, and put thou thy trust in the Lord.

PRAYER FOR CHARITY.

O LORD, Who hast taught us that all our doings without charity are nothing worth, send Thy Holy Ghost and pour into my heart that most excellent gift; so that I may love Thee, O Lord my God, with all my heart, with all my mind, with all my soul, and with all my strength, and may love my neighbour as

myself. More particularly, I pray Thee to give me such a measure of Thy loving grace, so that I may not envy, may not vaunt myself, may not be puffed up, may not behave myself unseemly,¹ may not seek my own things, may not be easily provoked; but contrariwise, so that I may think no evil, may rejoice not in iniquity but in the truth, may bear all things without murmuring, may believe all things of Thee, may hope all things of my neighbour, may endure all things for Christ's sake. Grant this, I humbly pray Thee, through the same Christ Jesus, our Lord; Who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end. *Amen.*

PRAYER FOR UNITY.

O GOD, the Father of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, our only Saviour, the Prince of Peace, give grace to us and to all Thy people in this land, seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions. Take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly Union and Concord: that, as there is but one Body, and one Spirit, and one hope of our Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all, so we may seek henceforth to be all of one heart and of one soul, united in one holy bond of Truth and Peace, of Faith and Charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

SUGGESTED ADDITION TO CHURCH CATECHISM

Recommended by the Episcopal Synod of the Scottish Church.

Q. By whom are the HOLY SACRAMENTS administered?

A. They are administered by Clergy, duly ordained and licensed for that purpose.

Q. How many ORDERS OF CLERGY have there been in the Church from the Apostles' time?

A. There have been in the Church from the Apostles' time Three Orders of Clergy, viz. Bishops, Priests and Deacons.²

¹ I.e. in any way unbefitting a good Christian.

² See Preface to Ordination Service in Book of Common Prayer.

Q. What are the chief duties of a DEACON ?

A. It is a Deacon's duty to administer Baptism in the absence of the Priest, to assist the Priest in Divine Service, and to preach, if licensed thereto by the Bishop.

Q. What are the proper duties of a PRIEST ?

A. A Priest has authority to bless God's people in His name, to pronounce His pardon to the penitent, to consecrate the Holy Communion, and to perform all other Offices assigned to him in the Book of Common Prayer.

Q. What are the duties proper to a BISHOP ?

A. A Bishop has authority to rule and administer discipline, according to the Canons, in that portion of the Church over which he is set, to ordain Clergy,¹ to consecrate Churches and other places for sacred purposes, and to administer Confirmation.

Q. In what does CONFIRMATION consist ?

A. Confirmation consists in the Solemn Benediction and laying on of hands by the Bishop upon the heads of those whom he confirms, accompanied with his prayers, and the prayers of the Congregation on their behalf.

Q. To whom is Confirmation to be administered ?

A. To all those who, having come to years of discretion, are prepared and desirous to renew the promises made for them in their Baptism, and to ratify and confirm the same openly before the Church.

Q. What does the New Testament teach in regard to the obligation and benefits of Confirmation ?

A. The New Testament teaches that Confirmation is an Apostolic Ordinance² (Acts viii. 14-17, Heb. vi. 1-2)

¹ Viz. Deacons, by himself alone; Priests, with the assistance of any Priests who may be present; and Bishops, with the co-operation of other Bishops, commonly not less than two.

² Compare Canon lx. of the Church of England.

designed to convey an increased measure of the gifts of the Holy Spirit to those who receive it worthily.

Q. What rule has the Church laid down with reference to admission to Holy Communion?

A. The Church orders that none shall be admitted to the Holy Communion until he has been confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed.¹

'A Certificate of Confirmation, signed by the Bishop, shall be given to each person who has been confirmed.'—CANON xl. 7.

APPENDIX IV

REMARKS ON THE ARCHBISHOP'S JUDGMENT (1890)

The Bishop of St. Andrews welcomed the appointment of Archbishop Benson in 1882 in the following lines:—

As Abram's name to Abraham,
 In earnest of undying fame,
 Was changed by Voice from heaven;
 So, raised to the primatial throne,
 May Benson changed to Benison
 Henceforth proclaim in richest boon
 Blessing received and given.

He was therefore ready to accept the Archbishop's Judgment in 1890, though in some respects it went beyond his own previous conclusions. The following sentences express his opinion:—

I do not quarrel with the conclusions of the Judgment as a whole, but I think it would have gone upon safer ground if it had taken some such line as this. Our Church does not disallow the doctrine of a Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist, but it desires to keep it within due bounds.

The doctrine allowable is *not* that of the Mass, is not that of a continuous sacrifice in any sense, so as to interfere with the perfect sacrifice offered once for all; and it is such as to yield greater prominence, as the New Testament itself appears to do, to the doctrine of Holy Communion. Now *fairness* requires that this latter and more prominent

¹ See Rubric at the end of the Confirmation Office.

doctrine should not be obscured by the structure of an altar which ceases to be a table, or, as Bishop Phillpotts preferred to call it 'God's board.'

Bishop Andrewes writes in his famous Sermon of the 'Worshipping of Imaginations' [(*Sermons*, v. 66, A. C. L.) with regard to the Imaginations of the Church of Rome concerning the Eucharist, 'that she many times celebrateth the mystery *sine fractione* "without any breaking" at all. Whereas, as heretofore hath been showed out of the tenth chapter of the first of Corinthians, the eighteenth verse, it is of the nature of a Eucharist or peace-offering: which was never offered but it was eaten, that both these might be a representation of the memory of that sacrifice, and together an application to each person by partaking it.'] Let both therefore be *indifferent*; let not the Altar so intrude upon the Table as to obscure the significance which the latter implies.

In a letter dated 3 December, 1890, and published in the *London Times*, with the signature EPISCOPUS, he first praises the spirit in which the Judgment was conceived and carried out, and especially its concluding sentences. He then asks, what are the practical results which wise men not mixed up with either party, would desire to see, especially as to two points, the Eastward Position and the singing of the *Agnus*. Setting aside doctrinal considerations (as ruled by the Archbishop to be irrelevant) he thinks the North end position to be preferred, as (a) facilitating the breaking of bread before the people; (b) not interfering with the ordinary position of saying the prayers, but in harmony with it.

In any case 'no Altar ought to be allowed to be so erected that a clergyman cannot stand at the north end, which the Judgment states to be "beyond question a true Liturgical use of the Church of England" and hitherto a far more general and accepted course.'

In regard to the singing of the *Agnus Dei* before reception, he notes that the Judgment, while holding it not unlawful, would seem to regard it as unwise, because the words occur twice in other places, viz. in the Litany and the Post-Communion. He adds a further reason which he thinks far stronger, that in the Proper Preface for Easter we do not say that the Lamb of God 'taketh away' the sin of the world, but 'He is the very Paschal Lamb which *was offered* for us and *hath taken away* the sin of the world.' This has come down to us from the Gelasian Sacramentary.

APPENDIX V

THE WAVERLEY NOVELS ARRANGED CHRONOLOGICALLY

(Intended to show how a student of Walter Scott might gain an idea of almost the whole of modern history.)

1. *Count Robert of Paris* (A.D. 1080 &c., First Crusade).
2. *The Betrothed* (A.D. 1187 &c.).
3. *Ivanhoe* (A.D. 1195 &c.).
4. *The Talisman* (A.D. 1205 &c.).
5. *Castle Dangerous* (A.D. 1306, Robert Bruce of Scotland).
6. *Fair Maid of Perth* (A.D. 1380, Robert III. of Scotland).
7. *Quentin Durward* (A.D. 1468).
8. *Anne of Geierstein* (A.D. 1477 &c.).
9. *The Monastery* (A.D. 1550 &c.).
10. *The Abbot* (A.D. 1558, Mary Queen of Scots).
11. *Kenilworth* (A.D. 1560).
12. *Fortunes of Nigel* (A.D. 1602, James I. of England).
13. *Legend of Montrose* (A.D. 1643-6, Charles I.).
14. *Woodstock* (A.D. 1649-60, Commonwealth and Restoration).
15. *Peveril of the Peak* (A.D. 1658, Commonwealth and Charles II.).
16. *Old Mortality* (A.D. 1679 &c. Charles II. and William III.).
17. *Bride of Lammermoor* (A.D. 1689, William III.).
18. *Black Dwarf* (A.D. 1707 &c.).
19. *Rob Roy* (A.D. 1715, George I.).¹
20. *Pirate* (A.D. 17— George I. &c.).
21. *Heart of Midlothian* (A.D. 1736, George II.).
22. *Waverley* (A.D. 1745, George II.).
23. *Redgauntlet* (A.D. 1750-65, George II. and III.).
24. *Guy Mannering* (George III., after A.D. 1777).
 [The reference to Dr. Robertson as 'the historian of Scotland, of the Continent, and of America,' in chap. xxxvii., fixes the date as after 1777, i.e. to the reign of George III., which began in 1760. I owe this reference to Dean Boyle.]
25. *Antiquary* (George III., A.D. 1790-1800).
 ['*Waverley* embraced the age of our fathers, *Guy Mannering* that of our own youth, and the *Antiquary* refers to the last ten years of the eighteenth century.' *Advertisement* (1829).]
26. *Highland Widow* (circa A.D. 1790).
27. *Surgeon's Daughter* (A.D. 1800-1810 &c.).
28. *St. Ronan's Well* (do.).

¹ The Bishop had not quite made up his mind as to the order of the later novels. I have therefore made the series a little more exact.

APPENDIX VI

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1888 AND HOME
REUNION*(See pp. 253–259)**Letter from Bishop Barry, Chairman of the Committee*

Bishop Barry has been good enough to accede to my request to illustrate the proceedings of the important Committee over which he presided, and of which my uncle was a member—as far as he could do so without breach of confidence. His lucid statement will be read with interest; and it will, I hope, tend to promote the end which the Lambeth Conference primarily had in view, viz. the holding of Conferences with representatives of the separated communions. His letter is dated 9 December 1898.

J. S.

The published Report and Resolution of 1888 will show clearly that we held, as the only permanent basis of Reunion, to what has been called ‘the Lambeth quadrilateral,’ which was itself an amended, and somewhat enlarged, revision of the basis previously suggested by the American Church. On the ‘historic Episcopate’ we were, I think, quite unanimously determined to take our stand—in view, both of the intrinsic merits of the case, and of the relation of our Church to the great Latin and Eastern Communions. In fact, on the matter contained in our present Report, there was, except on mere details, no difference of opinion. I can see now, in the light of the event, that it would have probably better advanced the cause we had at heart, if we had been contented to bring forward this only, and to wait for the result of the Conferences therein proposed.

But it was urged by some members of the Committee—holding (I suppose) on the subject something like Bishop Wordsworth’s position—that our proposal of these Conferences with the separated Communions would be absolutely fruitless, unless we were prepared to suggest some means of bridging over the transitional period in any process of Reunion in regard to the crucial question of the Ministry of Non-Episcopal Communions. That we held it to be irregular, and contrary to primitive Church Order, was indicated by our previous determination to accept the historic Episcopate as one of the permanent bases of Reunion. But were we to require that the members and ministers of these Communions should acknowledge it to be absolutely invalid? Or, considering ‘the [present distress],’ could we go into

Conference with some acknowledgment on our part of a spiritual reality in it—as evidenced by spiritual fruits of its ministrations—sufficient to prepare, if not for Corporate Reunion, at least for such relations as might perhaps lead to it in the hereafter? We were, of course, aware that the position of the Ministry varied greatly in the different Non-Conformist bodies, and that these must affect the degree of recognition which could be rightly given to it. I think that Bishop Wordsworth would have preferred that we should have dealt primarily or exclusively with the strongest case—the case of the Presbyterian Ministry.¹ Certainly we had the Presbyterians, and perhaps also the great Wesleyan Body, especially in view. But the Committee were generally inclined to think that these differences between the various Non-Conformist bodies would emerge, whenever the proposed Conferences were held, and that any Resolution on the subject must be for the present couched in general terms.

On the question so raised there was, I need not say, great conflict of opinion, and considerable opposition to any declaration on the subject—strong, although by no means so strong as that which was afterwards manifested in the Conference itself. After much serious debate the final Resolution was carried, with some considerable variation (I may remark) from the original draft. It is curious that the particular phrase ‘Ministerial character’ was not in that draft, but was substituted for a clause, distinguishing between irregularity and invalidity, on the motion of a leading member of the Committee, who was opposed to the whole Resolution, and spoke strongly against it in the subsequent debate of the Conference. Whether he attached to it the very definite and almost technical meaning assigned to it by some speakers in that debate, I do not know. But I think that the Committee generally accepted it, rightly or wrongly, as a term of the widest generality, leaving room for much variety of interpretation, and perhaps varying also in its application to various cases. The position, as I understood it, taken up by the majority of the Committee, was very much that of the well-known declaration of Archbishop Bramhall²; and this was made plainer in the original Draft of the Resolution, which contained the words ‘whether by conditional reordination or otherwise.’ Probably they did not enter into the question how it could be practically carried out, thinking that this belonged to the proposed Conferences,

¹ The Bishop in a letter to one of his sons (Rydal, 1 August, 1888) says: ‘Though I was thankful upon the whole for Barry’s Resolution and heartily supported it, it was not the way (as I told the Committee) that I myself should have chosen for dealing with the matter. It was too *indiscriminative* and asserted the crucial principle *too broadly*. In England you cannot afford to deal with Dissent *en masse*. What I asked for in my Pamphlet was not that; and I dare say I shall find that what I did ask for has been granted.’

² See above, pp. 262–3 note.

to which they wished to give a fair chance of success. It must be remembered that they desired to see steps taken 'either towards corporate reunion or towards such relation as may prepare for fuller organic unity hereafter.' I imagine that the latter of these alternatives was chiefly before their minds, as more likely to be practicable, and that they had the idea of a kind of Federation of Congregations of the Non-Episcopal Bodies—if any proposal for Reunion was accepted—retaining their own present Ministers under Episcopal recognition, with the understanding that in the hereafter there should be Episcopal Ordination for their successors. Probably also some consecration to the Episcopate *per saltum* was contemplated in the case of leading Ministers of any of these Communions. But these ideas were not, and could not be, embodied in the Resolution.

A subsequent question arose, whether this Resolution should be simply left in the Report as the opinion of the Committee, or submitted to the Conference for consideration and adoption by them. On this there was again difference of opinion; but it was decided to take the latter course as most straightforward and explicit.

Bishop Wordsworth attended the final meeting of the Committee, and signified his cordial adhesion to the Resolution. I remember his saying, 'If this is carried, I may sing my *Nunc Dimittis*.' I do not think that he took any part in the discussion of it in the Conference.

Before the Report was presented, this final Resolution—by what I must hold to have been a serious breach of the law of the Conference—was published in the *Times* without the explanation which led up to it in the Report itself. The publication produced strong excitement, and in some degree, I think, prejudiced the discussion which afterwards took place upon it in the Conference itself.

It became my duty, as chairman of the Committee, to lay the Report before the Conference and move the Resolutions appended to it. The motion was, I remember, seconded by a leading Bishop of the American Church. A prolonged and most earnest discussion followed, in which many of the leading members of the Conference took part. I may remark that a report (which I saw in one of the papers), that Bishop Lightfoot led the opposition to it, was absolutely erroneous. He did not, so far as I remember, speak on the matter at all, and he voted for a modification of the Resolution in question, which was proposed as an amendment. But it is sufficient to note the result of the discussion, which was, that the Report was referred back to the Committee with a virtual instruction to omit all the last section and the Resolution based upon it. This was, of course, done, and the Report, brought up nearly in its present form, was accepted, and the Resolutions based upon it were carried, with some modifications of detail, as they now stand in the Report of the Conference.

How far the proposed Conferences with the representatives of Non-Conformist Communions were held I hardly know. For I was

obliged, for private and personal reasons, to resign almost immediately my position as Primate of Australia, which would have enabled me to initiate them there. But certainly no substantial results appear to have followed from them. The question was no nearer solution when the next Lambeth Conference met in 1897; and the Committee on the subject, presided over by the Archbishop of Armagh, only recommended one further practical step (which was adopted by the Conference), by requesting the authorities of our Church to take a more distinct initiative in regard to the Conferences with other Communion, and to lay reports on the subject before the next Lambeth Conference. But it was profoundly significant that the Conference, on the recommendation of the Committee, passed an emphatic Resolution declaring visible unity among Christians to be an element of the Divine Revelation, without, of course, defining the form which such unity should assume; and, indeed, in all its Resolutions referring to the great subject of unity in all its various aspects it showed a marked desire to endeavour, so far as might be, to prepare for some realisation of this fundamental principle.

As yet it remains simply an ideal and an aspiration. But, even so, it must call out serious thought and suggest earnest prayer. From these we may trust that in God's good time there may follow practical advance towards some measure of Reunion, to remove or soften our unhappy divisions now splintering up the Christianity which ought to be one.

APPENDIX VII

LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL PRINTED WRITINGS OF CHARLES WORDSWORTH IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

[The size given is as far as possible taken from the signature of the sheets. In case of pamphlets of unusual gatherings they have been noted as 'sm. 8vo' when they were not obviously of smaller size.]

- 1827 (May).* *Mexica, Poema Cancellarii praemio donatum et in Theatro Sheldoniano recitatum* sext. cal. Jun. MDCCCXXVII. Excudebat G. King, Oxonii. [Oxford Prize Poem on Mexico, signed 'Charles Wordsworth, Ch. Ch.'] Pp. 18 + fly-leaf, 8vo.
- 1831 (May).* *Oratio Cancellarii praemio donata et in Theatro Sheldoniano habita, die Iunii XV^{to} A.D. MDCCCXXXI.* Oxford. Published by D. A. Talboys. Title *Quaenam fuerit Oratorum Atticorum apud populum Auctoritas*. Signed 'Carolus Wordsworth ex Aede Christi.' [Oxford Latin Prize Essay.] Pp. 41, 8vo. Oxford, Talboys. * Reprinted in *Annals*, i. 363-392.
- 1835? (no date). [*Notes on the Life of Horace*] headed: 'Upon the Basis of the following Notes and Questions, chiefly formed

from a chronological arrangement of passages to be found in the poet's own works, compose A MEMOIR OF THE LIFE AND TIMES OF HORACE, &c.' Apparently for school use at Winchester. Pp. 12, 8vo. No printer's name.

- 1839 (January). *Græcæ Grammaticæ Rudimenta. In usum Scholarum.* [The Latin preface is signed 'C. W.,' Ventæ Belgarum, Mens. Jan. 1839. At the end of preface the author refers to 'fratrimo Joanni Wordsworth, M.A. Collegii SS. Trin. apud Cant. Socio.'] Pp. vi + 116, 12mo. Londini, apud Joannem Murray.
- 1840 (12 July). *A Sermon on 1 John v. 18, preached in Winchester College Chapel.* Pp. 15, 8vo.
- 1841 (11 November). *Evangelical Repentance: A Sermon preached in Winchester Cathedral for S.P.C.K. and S.P.G.* Pp. xvi + 70, 8vo. Oxford, J. H. Parker; London, Rivingtons.
- 1842 *Appendix to a Sermon on Evangelical Repentance, &c.* Pp. vi + 138, 8vo. Oxford, J. H. Parker; London, Rivingtons.
- 1842 *Catechetical questions; including heads of lectures preparatory to Confirmation.* With imprint 'Winchester College': see 1844. [In possession of C. W. Holgate.]
- 1843 (?). [English translation of the Winchester School song *Domum* in J. Hullah's *Part-music*]. Reprinted in *The College of St. Mary Winton*, pp. 33, 35, and *Annals*, i. 394-5. (See 1848.)
- 1843 *Communion in Prayer, or the Duty of the Congregation in Public Worship. Three Sermons preached in the College Chapel, Winchester.* [Stamp, College Arms, designed by H. G. Liddell.] Pp. [vi] + 88, sm. 8vo. London, James Burns, 17 Portman Street; Oxford, J. H. Parker.
- [1843 ?] *Syntaxis et Prosodia.* At the end of the third edition of the *Greek Grammar* (pp. xii + 187, London, John Murray, 1841) is this note: 'Lectori. Syntaxim et Prosodiam, quæ mox prelo subjicientur, separatim licebit emere.' A copy of the fourth edition of the *Greek Grammar* has not been obtainable for the purpose of this bibliography, and, therefore, presumably the fifth edition, 1844 (the first printed at Oxford) was the first which contained the Syntax. Presumably, however, it was at first printed as a separate work (though no copy of it is now forthcoming), for, in the publisher's prefatory note to an edition of the *Eton Greek Grammar*, published in 1845, it is stated that 'the Syntax used at Winchester has been adopted at Eton, and will continue to be used instead of the second part of the old *Eton Greek Grammar*.' See Bishop Charles Wordsworth's *Annals*, vol. i. pp. 177-196. [Note by C. W. H.]
- 1844 *Græcæ Grammaticæ Rudimenta. In usum Scholarum.* [First edition published by the Oxford University Press. The Syn-

- taxis here occupies pp. 163–218, but is not mentioned in the Index. There is no new preface, but the prefaces to the first three editions are included.] Editio quinta, Oxonii: e typographeo academico, mdcccxlv., pp. xii + 258, 8vo. [C. W. H.]
- 1844 *Catechetical questions*. [See 1842.] Pp. 88, 12mo. Second edition. London, F. and J. Rivington.
- 1845 (Whitsunday). *A Lecture to the Communicants of Winchester College, preparatory to the Holy Communion*. Pp. 27, 8vo.
- 1845 *Family Prayers designed especially for the use of a Household observing in one or more of its members Daily attendance upon the Services of the Church*. Pp. ii + 76, 12mo. London, F. and J. Rivington.
- 1845 (December). [Bp. Ken's Morning, Evening, and Midnight hymns in English and Latin.] *Tres Hymni ad usum scholarium Wiccamicorum olim Anglice compositi nunc Latine redditi*. Wintoniae: veneunt apud D. Nutt, Collegii Bibliopolam. Colledge arms on cover. Dedication to Wykehamists signed C. W. Pp. 29 + 3, 8vo.
- 1845 [Keble's Morning and Evening Hymns in English and Latin.] *Dies oriens et occidens Christianus sive duo carmina libro, qui "Annus Christianus" inscribitur, praemissa, Latine reddita*. Wintoniae: veneunt apud D. Nutt, Collegii bibliopolam. Colledge arms on cover. Dedication to J. Keble 'Auctori interpres' &c. Pp. 24, 8vo.
- 1845 *Rejoicing a Privilege of Watchful Christians*. No. 8 in Alex. Watson's *Sermons for Sundays, Festivals and Fasts*. 1st series. 8vo. London, Masters &c.
- 1846 *The Blessings of Purity*. No. 19 in 2nd series of ditto, vol. i.
- 1846 (Quinquagesima Sunday). *The better gifts and the more excellent way*. A Farewell Sermon in Winchester College Chapel. Pp. 20, 8vo. London, Rivington; Winchester, D. Nutt.
- 1846 (27 March). *Christian Boyhood at a Public School: a collection of Sermons and Lectures delivered at Winchester College*. Two vols. 8vo. Dedicated to Dr. Moberly. Vol. I. *Duties and Ordinances*. (Pp. xiv + 504.) Vol. II. (Pp. x + 459.) *Graces and Examples*. London, F. and J. Rivington; Winchester, D. Nutt.
- 1846 (13 August). *The true charter of education for all classes in a Christian land*. A Sermon preached at Whitwick in behalf of the parochial schools, and a Supplement [on Diocesan organisation for Education]. Pp. 67, 8vo. London (n. p.)
- 1846 *Address at Stone Laying of Trinity College, Glenalmond*. 4to. [B. M. 1220 f. 24.]
- 1847 (29 August). *Two Sermons* by the Lord Bishop of Oxford and the Warden of Trinity College, Glenalmond, at the consecration

- of St. Andrew's Chapel, Fasque. Pp. viii + 41, 8vo. Montrose, Smith & Co., &c.
- 1848 *The College of St. Mary, Winton, near Winchester.* [No author's name on title. Four elegiacs beginning 'Terra tulit flores,' signed C. W. on p. [iii.]] Pp. [vi] + 136, sm. 4to. Oxford and London, J. H. Parker; Winchester, D. Nutt. (Printed by J. Shrimpton, Oxford.)
- 1849 (27 March). *An Address* read at the meeting of the Special Synod of the United Diocese of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane. [Wm. Palmer's appeal; passive communion; confession and absolution.] Pp. 19, 8vo. Printed by order of the Synod.
- 1849 (5 May). *A Letter to Rev. W. Skinner, D.D., Bishop of Aberdeen and Primus, respecting the further prosecution of the question of passive Communion.* Pp. 28, 8vo. For private circulation only.
- 1849 *Catechesis; or, Christian Instruction preparatory to Confirmation and first Communion.* Pp. iv + 212, 8vo. First edition. London, F. and J. Rivington. See 1842 and 1844.
- 1850 (26 July). *A Letter to the Right Rev. Patrick Torry, Bishop of the United Diocese of St. Andrews, &c.* [On the Prayer-book authorised by him.] Pp. 16, 8vo. Edinburgh, Grant; London and Oxford, J. H. Parker.
- 1850 (July and August). *Seven Letters to the 'Guardian' on the Report of the Proceedings of the Synod of St. Andrews, &c., published in that paper, with appendix and postscript.* [Also on Bishop Torry's Prayer-book.] Pp. 72, 8vo. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son; London and Oxford, J. H. Parker.
- 1850 (September). *A Sermon on occasion of the Offertory directed to be made in Scotland on behalf of Trinity College, Glenalmond.* Pp. 42, sm. 8vo. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son, R. Lendrum and Co.; London, F. and J. Rivington; Oxford, J. H. Parker.
- 1850 *Catechesis* (see 1849). Second edition. Pp. [iv] + 228, 12mo. London, F. and J. Rivington.
- 1851 (February). *National Repentance.* *Scottish Eccl. Journal.*
- 1851 (March). *Religious Toleration.* *S. E. J.*
- 1851 (May). *Separation of Church and State.* *S. E. J.*
- 1851 (June 19). *Protestant Religion and the Catholic Faith.* *S. E. J.*
- 1851 (July). *On the present distress in the Church of England.* *S. E. J.*
- 1851 (17 April, 21 August). *Diocesan Episcopacy proved from the New Testament.* (In two parts.) *S. E. J.*
- 1851 (10 September). *National Christianity, an article of the Christian Faith.* A sermon preached in the Parish Church, Kidderminster, for jubilee of S.P.G., on St. Matthew xxviii. 18-20.

- with Appendix on *Appointments to the Episcopate in the Colonies and Mother Country* from *S. E. J.* June, 1851. Pp. 35, 8vo. London, F. and J. Rivington.
- 1851 (18 September). *The Archbishop of Dublin's Charge and the Bangorian controversy.* *S. E. J.*
- 1851 (16 October, and November). *Presbyterian ordination* (containing a catena of Anglican authorities on the invalidity of Presbyterian orders). *S. E. J.*
- 1851 (18 December). *The Duke of Argyll and the Oxford Protest; or how to reconeile the authority of the Church and the right of private judgment.* *S. E. J.*
- 1852 (January). *Presbyterian Testimonies in favour of Episcopacy.* I. *Luther and the German Protestants (1517-1546).*
- 1852 (February). *A letter to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P. on the Doctrine of Religious Liberty.* First edition: pp. 63, 8vo. Oxford and London, J. H. Parker; Edinburgh, Grant and Son. Second edition: pp. 48, 12mo. London, Rivingtons; Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son.
- 1852 (March). *The Change of Ministry.* *S. E. J.*
- 1852 (April and May). *The Council of Sardica and the Appellate Jurisdiction of the See of Rome.* Also a letter *Laymen in Synods: 'Cautus' and the Conneil of Sardiea.* *S. E. J.*
- 1852 (16 June). *Lay Membership in Church Synods.* An address at the Synod of the United Diocese of St. Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane. [Supporting Bishop Torry's opinion *against* it. See 1870, 2 June.] Pp. 37, 8vo. London, F. and J. Rivington; R. Grant and Son, Edinburgh.
- 1852 (July). *The Parliamentary Oath and the Coronation Service.* *S. E. J.*
- 1852 (August and September). *Poliey of English Churchmen at the present Crisis.* *S. E. J.*
- 1853 (6 April). *Report of the Proceedings of the special Synod of the United Dioceses of St. Andrews &c., with Sermon* preached by the Right Rev. the Bishop. [First Synod as Bishop, chiefly on St. Ninian's.] Pp. ii + 72, 8vo. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son; R. Lendrum and Co.
- 1853 (6 July). *Code of Statutes for St. Ninian's, Perth,* with the *Bishop's Address* at the Diocesan Synod. Pp. 12, 8vo. Perth, printed by C. G. Sidey.
- 1853 (9 July). *The Constitution or Code of Statutes for St. Ninian's, Perth.* [Separately printed, in red and black.]
- 1853 (21 September). *St. Matthew an example for the Church in Scotland.* A Sermon in the Cathedral of St. Ninian on St.

Matthew's Day. (Enthronisation.) Pp. 18, sm. 8vo. Burntisland, printed at the Pitsligo Press.

- 1854 (21 September). *A Primary Charge to the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese of St. Andrews &c.*, delivered in St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth, on St. Matthew's Day. [On Presbyterian Baptism.] Pp. 30, 8vo. Perth, E. G. Sydey [*sic!*]; Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son, R. Lendrum and Co.; London and Oxford, J. H. Parker.
- 1854 *St. Andrew's Tracts*. No. 1. *Ad Ministros*. *Bingham on the Unity and Discipline observed in the ancient Church, with Appendix*. Pp. 51, 8vo. Burntisland, Pitsligo Press; Edinburgh, Grant and Son, R. Lendrum and Co.
- 1854 [*Twenty-four*] *Sermons preached at Trinity College, Glenalmond*. [No author's name on title. Preface signed 'C. W., S. Andr. Ep.' Nos. 1, 2, 6, 11, 13, 23, 24, are by him.] Pp. vi + 335, 12mo. Edinburgh, Grant and Son, R. Lendrum and Co.; Aberdeen, A. Wilson; London and Oxford, J. H. Parker; Cambridge, Macmillan.
- 1855 (January). *Three short Sermons on The Holy Communion, as a Sacrifice, Sacrament, and Eucharist*, with notice of the differences between the Scotch and English offices. Pp. vii + 80. London and Oxford, J. H. Parker; Edinburgh, Grant and Son, Lendrum and Co.
- 1855 (April). *What is National Humiliation without National Repentance?* together with two letters, one to the secretaries of the Protestant Conference, and one to Presbyterian Ministers of all denominations within the Diocese of St. Andrews. Pp. 54, 12mo. Glasgow, Maurice Ogle and Son; London and Oxford, J. H. Parker; Perth, Sidey.
- 1855 (28, 29 August). *A Report of the Proceedings of the Synod and Visitation*, including the *Bishop's Visitation Sermon* on 2 Tim. iv. 5, *The Twofold Ministry of Clergy and Laity*. [Baptism by immersion.] With Appendix of Diocesan Statistics. Pp. 36, 8vo. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son; London, J. H. and J. Parker.
- 1855 (September). *Report of Diocesan Synod*. S. E. J.
- 1855 (September). *The Bishop of St. Andrews' Visitation Sermon* S. E. J.
- 1856 (16 September). *Papal Aggression in the East, or the Protestantism of the Oriental Churches*. Republished from the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*. Pp. 23, 8vo. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son; London and Oxford, J. H. Parker.
- 1856 *The heart purified by Faith*. *A Sermon preached in St. John Baptist Church, Perth, dedicated to the memory of Capt. the*

- Hon. R. Drummond.* Pp. 15, 8vo. Perth, Printed by C. Paton.
- 1857 (Trinity Sunday) *Mending of the Nets.* Oxford Ramsden Sermon for 1857, upon *Church Extension in the Colonies and Dependencies of the British Empire.* Pp. 32, 8vo. London, Bell and Daldy.
- 1857 (29 December). *Statement* in regard to the action of the Episcopal Synod of 11 December signed by Bishops Eden and Wordsworth.
- 1857 *Catechesis &c.* [see 1849]. Post 8vo., third edition. London. Rivington.
- 1858 (16 February). *Pastoral Letter addressed to the Laity of the United Diocese.* [On the Eucharist.] Reprinted as Appendix I. to *Charge* of 13 September, 1859.
- 1858 (7 March). *The Christian Embassy.* A sermon at Westminster Abbey. Pp. 13, 12mo. London, Bell and Daldy.
- 1858 (27 May). [*The Six Bishops' Synodal Letter on the Charge of Bishop Forbes of Brechin.*] Fly sheet, folio. See Appendix II.
- 1858 (14 September). *Charge to the Clergy at the Diocesan Synod, 1858, with Appendix.* [Eucharistic controversy. Synodal Letter of Six Bishops, 27 May, 1858.] Pp. 28, 8vo. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son; London, J. H. and J. Parker.
- 1858 (14 September). *Report of Proceedings* at the Synod of the Diocese of St. Andrews, &c. [Scottish Office, &c.] Pp. 35, 8vo. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son; London, J. H. and J. Parker.
- 1858 (September). *Notes to assist towards forming a right judgment on the Eucharistic Controversy,* with copy of *Synodal Letter* from the Six Bishops to all faithful members of the Church in Scotland (27 May). Pp. 66, 4to. Privately printed.
- 1858 (4 November). *Opinion of the Bishop of St. Andrews on the Appeal of Rev. P. Cheyne,* delivered at the Episcopal Synod at Edinburgh, with *Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese* on the same subject. Pp. 36, 8vo. William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London.
- 1858 (Advent). *Supplement to Notes on the Eucharistic Controversy.* Pp. 14, 4to. Privately printed.
- 1859 (5 February). *Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. Andrews &c.* [On an article reprinted from the *Christian Remembrancer* sent round to the Clergy, and similar letters touching the Eucharistic Controversy.] Pp. 8, 8vo.
- 1859 (20 March). *A Plain Tract on the Scotch Communion Office, its History, Principles and Advantages.* Pp. 23, 8vo. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son.

- 1859 (13 September). *Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. Andrews &c. at the Annual Synod.* [St. Ninian's Declaration. Position of the Celebrant at Holy Communion.] With Appendix I. *Pastoral Letter to the Laity*, 16 February, 1858; II. *Pastoral Letter issued by Episcopal Synod*, 27 May, 1858; III. *Perth Collegiate School*. Pp. 39, 8vo. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son; London, Rivington.
- 1859 *Proposals for Peace, or a few remarks on the Eucharistic Doctrine of Bishops Taylor, Ken and Wilson with reference to the recent Pastoral of the Bishop of Brechin*, with a postscript on the case of Mr. Cheyne. [Anon.] Pp. 48, 8vo. Edinburgh, Thomas Constable and Co.; Hamilton, Adams and Co., London.
- 1860 (25 August). *The Bishop's Charge at the ordinary Synod held at Dunkeld.* [Short address, Diocesan troubles.] *S. E. Journal*, p. 153.
- 1861 (29 August). *Charge at Ordinary Synod held at Dunblane.* [On 1661 and 1761.] *S. E. Journal*, p. 124.
- 1861 *Opinion of the Bishop of St. Andrews, delivered in the Episcopal Synod at Edinburgh.* [On Bishop Forbes' case.] 15 March, 1860. Pp. 64 + viii (*Supplementary Note, Presentment and Sentence*), 8vo. Printed for private circulation, Greenock, A. Mackenzie and Co.
- 1861 *A Common Catechism, or fundamental Christian Instruction, wherein are combined the Catechism of the Book of Common Prayer, and the Shorter (Westminster) Catechism, with a Preface.* Pp. x + 21, 8vo. Edinburgh. Printed by Thomas Constable. Not published.
- 1861 (30 November, 4 and 7 December). *Scepticism and the Church of England.* [A review of Lord Lindsay's two letters with that title on *Essays and Reviews*, Murray, 1861.] *Edinburgh Evening Courant*.
- 1861 (December). *A United Church of Scotland, England, and Ireland advocated. A Discourse on the Scottish Reformation, to which are added Proofs and Illustrations, designed to form a manual of Reformation facts and principles.* First ed. Pp. viii + 154, sm. 8vo. Edinburgh, Edmonston and Douglas.
- 1862 (22 August). *Reunion of the Church in Great Britain.* Bicen-tenary Address at Kidderminster. Pp. 47, 12mo. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son; London, Rivingtons.
- 1862 (16 September). *Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. Andrews at the Synod held in St. John's Church, Perth.* [On General Synod and Scottish Office.] Pp. 27, 8vo. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son; London, Rivingtons. [Also

in *S.E.J.* Latter part reprinted in *Contribution to Seabury Commemoration.*]

- 1863 *A United Church for the United Kingdom advocated. A Discourse on the Scottish Reformation, to which are added Proofs and Illustrations.* Second ed. (See 1861.) Pp. 106, 12mo. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son; London, Rivingtons.
- 1863 (19 February). *Letter to Rev. J. Torry, Dean of St Andrews, &c.* [concerning the Bishop's proposed resignation]. Pp. 16, 8vo. Printed at the *Perthshire Journal* office.
- 1863 (June). *Our Lord's Testimony to the Truth and Authority of the Old Testament.* A Sermon preached in St. Paul's Church, Balsall Heath, Birmingham [on Luke xvi. 31]. Pp. 16, 8vo. Birmingham, Henry Wright; London, Rivingtons.
- 1863 (3 September). *Uniformity in Church Government.* Synodal Charge at St. John's, Perth. Pp. 27, 12mo. London, Rivingtons; Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son.
- 1863 *Inscription for a Summer House in a garden attached to the Cathedral Close at Salisbury, beginning 'Hic est videndum quicquid est pulcherrimi.'* *St. Andrews Magazine*, p. 407.
- 1864 (April). *On Shakespeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible.* Pp. xii + 309, crown 8vo., 1st ed. Smith, Elder and Co., 65 Cornhill.
- 1864 (24 April). *Man's Excellency a Cause of Praise and Thankfulness to God.* A Sermon at Stratford-on-Avon on Ps. cxlv. 10. Pp. 28, 12mo. London, Smith, Elder and Co. [Reprinted in *Shakespeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible*, 3rd ed. 1880.]
- 1864 (October). *The Principles of Episcopalians as a basis of Christian Union.* Charge at Annual Synod, St. John's, Perth. Pp. 31, 8vo. *The Scottish Guardian*, pp. 412-442. See 1867. Welsh translation published by S.P.C.K. 12mo. (1865?)
- 1864 (6 December). *A National Catechism, being so much of the Shorter Catechism as relates to the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer.* Pp. 16, 12mo. Edinburgh, printed by R. and R. Clark.
- 1864 *Evidence before H.M. Commissioners for Schools. Report,* pp. 231-240.
- 1864 *On Shakespeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible.* Pp. xiv + 366, post 8vo. London, Smith, Elder and Co. Second edition, enlarged.
- 1865 (February). *Address to the Members of the Church of England Institute at Berwick, delivered 22 December, 1864.* Pp. 19, 8vo. *The Scottish Guardian*, pp. 41-60.
- 1865 (October). *The Duty of the Church towards foreign Christians.* A paper read at the Norwich Church Congress. Pp. 10, 8vo.

- 1865 (November). *On the Position and Duty of the Episcopalian Laity*. Charge at Annual Synod, St. John's, Perth, delivered 13 September. Pp. 31, 8vo. *The Scottish Guardian*, pp. 473–494.
- 1866 (February). *A Plea for Justice to Presbyterian Students of Theology and to the Scottish Episcopal Church*. In answer to some remarks of Very Rev. John Tulloch, D.D. Pp. 61, 8vo. Edinburgh, William Paterson.
- 1866 (March). *A Pastoral Letter* [addressed by the Bishops of the Church in Scotland to the Clergy and People, appointing Tuesday, 29 March, a Day of Prayer and Humiliation on account of the Cattle Plague] with Form of Prayer. Pp. 11, 8vo. C. G. Sidey, Printer, Perth.
- 1866 (9 March). *The School Greek Grammar*. A Letter to Rev. Dr. Moberly, D.C.L. Pp. 56, 8vo. Edinburgh: Printed by Thomas Constable.
- 1866 (May). *The Claims of the Poorer Brethren in Assemblies for Christian Worship*. A Sermon [on St. James ii. 10] preached in St. John Evangelist's Church, Perth, on Sunday, 29 April. Pp. 15, 8vo. Perth: printed at the *Journal Office*.
- 1866 (11 September). *The Ministry of the Church historically considered with reference to the circumstances of the Church in Scotland*. A Synodal Address at St. John's, Perth, with Appendix. Pp. iv + 70, 8vo. London, Macmillan and Co.
- 1867 *The Principles of Episcopals as a Basis of Christian Union*. Synodal Address at Perth, September 1864, with Appendix. Pp. viii + 124, sm. 8vo. London, Rivingtons; Edinburgh, Grant and Son. See 1864.
- 1867 (7 November). *The Lambeth Conference, its Aims and Performances: with some remarks upon the Address of the Moderator in the last General Assembly of the Church of Scotland*. A Synodal Address delivered at St. John's, Perth. Pp. 25, 8vo. Edinburgh, Robert Grant and Son; Aberdeen, A. Brown and Co.
- 1868 (July). *Charles Wordsworth: from the Scotichronicon vol. vi. edited by J. F. S. Gordon, D.D.* [Not by the Bishop, but mostly rewritten by Miss M. Barter and Rev. W. G. Shaw under his direction.] Pp. 27, imp. 8vo.
- 1868 (September). *Conference of Clergy and Laity at Perth containing address on Past History and Present Condition of the Diocese*. Reprinted from the *Perthshire Journal and Constitutional* of Thursday, 1 October.
- 1868 *Catechesis* [see 1849]. Post 8vo. Fourth edition. London, Rivingtons.

- 1869 (14 January). *The Scottish Church in its Relations, past and present, to the Church of England. Euodias and Syntyche.* Pp. 46, 12mo. Perth, Robert Whittet.
- 1869 *Sermon on Confirmation.* Pp. 19, 12mo. Perth, Robert Whittet.
- 1870 (2 June). *Admission of the Laity of the Scotch Episcopal Church to Additional Powers and Functions in its Synods.* Synodal Address, School Chapel, Perth, with postscript. Pp. iv + 40, 8vo. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son; London, Rivingtons.
- 1870 (26 July). *Choral Associations a Means of 'Stilling' the Enemies of the Gospel.* Sermon in Norwich Cathedral at the Eleventh Annual Festival of the Norfolk and Suffolk Church Choral Association. Pp. 19, 12mo. London, Rivingtons; Norwich, Samuel Miller.
- 1871 (January?) *A Greek Primer for the Use of Beginners in that Language.* [No author's name on title. The translation was made by his son Robert. Preface signed C. W., Perth, December 1870.] Pp. 8 + 88, 8vo. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press (published by Macmillan and Co., London).
- 1871 (January). *St. Andrews Episcopal School Chapel, Perth.* Fly sheet, with List of Subscribers. Pp. 4, folio.
- 1871 (27 July). *Preservation of St. Albans' Abbey a National Duty.* Sermon at St. Albans on the Fifth Festival of St. Albans' Church Choral Association. Pp. 22, 12mo. London and Oxford, James Parker and Co.
- 1871 (20 September). *A Charge delivered at the Annual Synod of the Diocese of St. Andrews, &c., in St. Andrew's School Chapel, Perth.* [Vacant Provostship, Primary Education, Episcopalian weakness in preaching.] Appendix: *The Constitution or Code of Statutes for St. Ninian's, Perth.* Pp. 28, 8vo. Edinburgh, Thomas and Archibald Constable.
- 1871 (December). *The Case of St. Ninian's, Perth, opinion of J. Guthrie Smith, Esq., Advocate &c., and Chancellor of the Diocese, with [Note] and Appendix to Case of St. Ninian's.* Pp. 3 + 1 + 4, 4to.
- 1872 (25 January). *The Outlines of the Christian Ministry delineated and brought to the test of reason, Holy Scripture, history and experience.* Pp. xxiii + 296, crown 8vo. London, Longmans, Green and Co.
- 1872 (26 September). Proceedings at Annual Synod, School Chapel, Perth, with *Charge on St. Ninian's Cathedral.* S. G. (October).
- 1872 *Contemplations on the Historical Passages of the Old and New Testaments, by the Right Rev. Joseph Hall, D.D., Bishop of*

Exeter and afterwards of Norwich, with *Introductory Memoir and notices of his other works*. [The memoir by Charles W. consists of xl. pp.] London, S.P.C.K.

- 1872-3 *Two addresses delivered to the Synod of the Diocese*. 26 September, 1872, and 8 May, 1873. *Also address to the Chapter of St. Ninian's* 6 March, 1873, with Appendix. Pp. 50, 4to. Privately printed.
- 1873 (30 January). [*Articles of Presentment* against Right Rev. C. Wordsworth, D.C.L., Bishop of St. Andrews &c., by Canon Humble and others.] Appendix, *Report of the Charge* delivered by Right Rev. C. Wordsworth, Bishop of St. Andrews &c. to the Synod, September, 1872. Pp. 42, 4to.
- 1873 (6 March). *Some Considerations respecting St. Ninian's Cathedral with the Bishop's Address delivered at the Meeting of Chapter*. Pp. 50, 4to., privately printed.
- 1873 (8 June). *The Doctrine of the Trinity as affected by recent criticism of the Text of the New Testament*. A Sermon on St. Matthew vi. 13, preached before the University of Oxford in the Chapel of New College on Trinity Sunday, 1873, *with some remarks on the congregational use of the Athanasian Creed*. Pp. xiv + 17, 8vo. London, Longmans, Green, and Co.
- 1873 (Christmas). *New Infants School in Perth*. Fly sheet with List of Subscribers. Pp. 3, 4to.
- 1874 (12 January). [*Answer to Address of the Dean and 18 Presbyters re St. Ninian's.*] Pp. 4, 8vo.
- 1874 (29 January). *Answer to Mr. Burton's Circular*. Fly sheet 4to.
- 1874 (15 April). *Letter to the Dean of the Diocese*, announcing his intention of resigning the Bishopric. Fly-leaf.
- 1874 (26 May). *Letter to the Dean*, postponing his resignation.
- 1874 (6 July). *Some Remarks on the Proposal to legalise the Eastward Position in the Celebration of Holy Communion*. Letter to Mr. Beresford Hope. (Second impression with additions.) Fly sheet, 4to.
- 1874 (25 September). *Preface to Burghclere Sunday-School Exercises under the teaching of Rev. W. B. Barter*. [On the character and work of Mr. Barter.] Pp. iii vi, crown 8vo. Oxford and London, James Parker and Co. [ed. 2, 1875.]
- 1874 (7 October). *Synodal Address, School Chapel, Perth*. [Statistical returns, Gladstone's Essay on Ritualism.] Report only.
- 1874 (1 November). *The Gospel a Defence against Evil Tidings*. A Sermon preached at Forfar on the occasion of the death of the Rev. W. G. Shaw, Incumbent of St. John's Episcopal Church, Forfar. Pp. 8, 8vo. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Sons; Forfar, W. Shepherd.

- 1875 (1 January). *Spiritual Edification in Reference to the Public Worship of God*. Sermon in St. Ninian's Cathedral. Pp. 7, 12mo. *Perth Constitutional Office*.
- 1875 (March). *The Convocation of York, on the Eastward Position*. Letter to the Editor of the *Times*. Fly-leaf.
- 1875 (6 October). *Charge at Diocesan Synod*. [Edinb. Ch. Congress.] *Scottish Guardian*, 8 October; *Perthshire Constitutional*, 6 Oct.
- 1876 (8 August). *Charge at Diocesan Synod*. [Preparation for General Synod. Trinity College, Glenalmond.] *Perthshire Constitutional and Journal*, 9 August.
- 1876 (19 September). *Three Conclusive Proofs that the use of the Eastward Position in the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist is contrary to the mind and intention of our Reformed Church*, with Appendix of Letters to Beresford Hope and the *Times*. Pp. 40, 8vo. London, Rivingtons; Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son; Dublin, Hodges, Foster and Co.
- 1876 (1 November). *Worship of God to be maintained under all circumstances: one of Three Sermons* preached at the reopening of the Choir of Salisbury Cathedral. On Daniel vi. 10. On pp. 45-66. 12mo. Salisbury, Brown and Co., &c.
- 1876 *In re Burntisland*. Pp. 38, 4to. Privately printed.
- 1876 *Episcopal Congregation, Burntisland*. Fly sheet, 4to.
- 1877 *Graecae Grammaticae Rudimenta in usum Scholarum*. Editio octava-decima. [No author's name on title. With the Latin prefaces of the 1st ed., 2nd ed., and 16th ed., each signed C.W.] Pp. xii + 260, 12mo. *Oxonii, e typographico Clarendoniano*.
- 1878 (February). *Scotch Disestablishment and Papal Aggression*. An article in the *Nineteenth Century Magazine*, February 1878. Pp. 22, imp. 8vo.
- 1878 (May). *The Law of Unity in the Christian Church*. An Article in the *Nineteenth Century Magazine*. Pp. 20.
- 1878 (August). *Suggested Additions to Church Catechism*, with *Introductory Remarks*, dated July 16, 1878, and a further note (after the Lambeth Conference, to which they were submitted) dated Bishopshall, St. Andrews, August 1878. [The suggestions are generally the same as on the card used at Confirmation.] Folio, fly sheet, 3 pp. and title. See Appendix VI.
- 1878 (19 September). *Charge at Synod*. [On Lambeth Conference and Laity in Synods.] *Scotsman and Edinburgh Courant*, 20 September.
- 1878 (19 October). *The Duty of Episcopalian Landowners to God, their Church, and their Country*. A Sermon preached at the Consecration of St. David's Church, Weem. On Ps. lxxix. 6. Pp. 15, 8vo. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son.

- 1878 (1 November). *A Greek Primer* [see 1871.] [Preface dated and signed C. W.] Pp. viii + 16, 12mo. Sixth edition. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press.
- 1878 (3 November). *The Church in Philadelphia a type of the Episcopal Church in Scotland.* Sermon preached at Dedication Festival at St. Paul's, Dundee. [On Rev. iii. 11.] Pp. 15, 8vo. Dundee, Winter, Duncan and Co.
- 1879 *Final Suggestions on New Testament Revision: the Four Gospels.* Pp. 32, 4to. Marked 'Private and Confidential.' Printed at Oxford by the Printer to the University.
- 1879 (17 January). *Final Suggestions.* Letter with the above, signed 'A member of the N. T. Company.' Pp. 3, 4to.
- 1879 (19 February). *The Primus and the French Old Catholics.* Letter to *Scottish Guardian*, 21 February, p. 92.
- 1879 (21 July). *Remarks on Dr. Lightfoot's Essay on the Christian Ministry.* Pp. iv + 78. Sm. 8vo. Oxford and London, James Parker and Co.
- 1879 (17 September). *Congregational Hymnody, and the Temperance Question.* Charge at the Diocesan Synod of St. Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane, in School Chapel, Perth. Pp. 20, sm. 8vo. Edinburgh, St. Giles's Printing Co.
- 1879 (October). *The Domestic System of the Church in the Education of her Sons, and especially of Candidates for the Sacred Ministry.* A sermon on behalf of Trinity College, Glenalmond (preached in 1850). Pp. 43, 8vo. Reprinted with appendix. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son, etc.
- 1879 (30 October). *More than Solomon is here.* A sermon preached at the Consecration of St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh. [On Matt. xii. 42.] Pp. 12, sm. 8vo. Edinburgh, St. Giles's Printing Co.
- 1879 (16 December). *Lord Bute's Breviary: a review.* *The Edinburgh Courant*, p. 2.
- 1880 (1 June). *The Rules laid down in Holy Scripture for its own Interpretation.* (Part I.) A Lecture delivered in the Chapter House of St. Paul's Cathedral to the members of the Church Homiletical Society. Pp. 14, 8vo. *The Clergyman's Magazine*, July 1880.
- 1880 (16 June). *Speech at the Wykehamist Dinner.* *Guardian*, 23 June. *Scottish Guardian*, 2 July.
- 1880 (August). *The Rules laid down in Holy Scripture for its own Interpretation.* (Part II.) A Lecture delivered in the Chapter House of St. Paul's Cathedral to the members of the Church Homiletical Society. Pp. 16, 8vo. *The Clergyman's Magazine*, August 1880.

- 1880 (August?) *Shakspeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible . . .* Third edition, with appendix containing additional illustrations and tercentenary sermon. Pp. xiv + 420. London, Smith, Elder and Co.
- 1880 (22 September). *Charge* in School Chapel, Perth, on Dismemberment of Trinity College, and the Duke of Argyll's speech at Ballachulish.
- 1880 (October). Commentary on *The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach or Ecclesiasticus* in *The Old Testament according to the A.V., with a Brief Commentary by various authors.* London: S.P.C.K. 1881. [The Editorial Secretary, however, gives the date October 1880. The book covers 137 pages.]
- 1880 (30 November). *Anni Christiani quæ ad Clerum pertinent Latine reddita, necnon Carmen Matutinum et Vespertinum: accedunt Hymni Tres Keniani.* Pp. viii + 111. Edinburgh, Grant et fil.
- 1881 (5 February). *The Pastoral Letter of the Scotch Bishops, May 1858.* Letter in Reply to Mr. W. Forbes. *Guardian*, February 9, p. 207. *Scottish Guardian*, February 18.
- 1881 (May). *A Discourse on Scottish Church History from the Reformation to the Present Time.* With prefatory remarks on St. Giles's Lectures, and Appendix, with notes, &c. Pp. 105. 8vo. London and Edinburgh, William Blackwood and Son.
- 1881 (30 August). *How to know the Love of Christ, or The Saintly Character exemplified in Queen Margaret, with Appendix.* Sermon at the Consecration of St. Margaret's Church, Leven. [On Eph. iii. 17-19.] Pp. 22. sm. 8vo. Edinburgh and London, William Blackwood and Son.
- 1881 (22 September). *Charge on the Revised New Testament.* *Scotsman, Glasgow Herald, Glasgow News*, of 23 September.
- 1881 (30 November). *The Syllogism of Chillingworth on the Christian Ministry. A tract for Scotland.* Pp. 7, 12mo. *Fifeshire Journal* office.
- 1882 *Græcæ Grammaticæ Rudimenta, In usum Scholarum, Editio undevicesima.* [This was the last edition of the Greek Grammar published in the author's lifetime, and is the current edition still. It contains the Prefaces to the first, second, and sixteenth editions, but has no Special Preface.] Oxonii, e typographeo Clarendoniano, mdcccclxxxii.
- 1882 (19 September). *Prospects of Reconciliation between Presbytery and Episcopacy.* Charge in St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth, [with account of the presentation of the Bishop's portrait]. Pp. 28, sm. 8vo. Edinburgh, St. Giles's Printing Co.
- 1883 *Speech after Consecration of the Bishop of Aberdeen, 1 May, 1883.* *The Aberdeen Daily Free Press*, p. 6, column 4.

- 1883 (July). *A Chapter of Autobiography*. [An Account of his Oxford private pupils, 1830-1833; with notices of the first Athletic contests between Oxford and Cambridge.] Pp. 21. *Fortnightly Review*.
- 1883 (5 September). *Sermon at St. Ninian's Choral Festival*. *Scottish Guardian*, 14 September.
- 1883 (6 September). *The Duty of Maintaining the Balance of Revealed Truth, with Particular Reference to the Holy Eucharist*. Synodal Charge in St. Ninian's Cathedral. Pp. 24, sm. 8vo. Edinburgh, St. Giles's Printing Co.
- 1883 (6 September). *The Bishop of Liverpool in Scotland*. Part of Charge at Diocesan Synod. *Scottish Guardian*, 14 September.
- 1883 (November). *Luther and the Original Protestants all favourable to Episcopacy*. (A contribution to the Luther Commemoration.) [Reprinted from *S. E. J.* January 1852.] Pp. 15, sm. 8vo. Edinburgh, St. Giles's Printing Co.
- 1883 *Shakspeare's Historical Plays Roman and English, with revised text, introductions, and notes, critical and historical*. 3 vols. Vol. 1, pp. xlvi + 443; vol. 2, pp. xx + 458; vol. 3, pp. xx + 464, 8vo. William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London.
- 1884 (January). *St. Chrysostom as an Orator: Part I. Disturbance at Antioch, A.D. 387; Part II., The Fall of the High Chamberlain Eutropius, A.D. 399*. A Popular Lecture. Pp. 32, 8vo. *The Scottish Church Review*, vol. i.
- 1884 (February). *St. Chrysostom as an Orator (cont.), Part III. The Empress Eudoxia and Chrysostom's Banishment, A.D. 403-404*. A Popular Lecture. Pp. 24, 8vo. *The Scottish Church Review*.
- 1884 (17 March). *Letter to the Very Rev. N. Johnston, Dean of St. Andrews*. [On Preaching in Presbyterian Churches.]
- 1884 (May). *Union or Separation*. Article reprinted from *The Scottish Church Review*. Pp. 23, 8vo.
- 1884 (July). *Union or Separation*. Letter by Sacerdos Tertius, *Scottish Guardian*, 4 July, p. 359.
- 1884 (5 August). *He maketh HIM familics like a Flock*. Ps. cvii. 41, 42. Sermon preached at the opening Service of the Mission Church of St. Fillan, Comrie. Pp. 7, 12mo. Crieff, *Herald* office.
- 1884 (27 August). *Spceeh at Opening of the Bazaar for Spire and Tower of Episcopal Church, St. Andrews*. [In defence of Bazaars for Church purposes.] *Fifeshire Journal*, 28 August, p. 5.

- 1884 (September). *A Contribution to the Scabury Commemoration*: (1) *Mending of the Nets*, Oxford Ramsden Sermon (1857); (2) *Confirmation an Ordinance Scriptural and Apostolical*. (A plain Sermon); (3) *Eucharistical Offices, English, Scotch, American* (Part of Charge of 1862). Pp. 70, 8vo. Aberdeen, John Avery and Co.
- 1884 (23 September). *Charge in Cathedral on Debate in General Assembly on Church Union, and on stringency of Presbyterian ordination formula.*
- 1884 (29 September). *An Address written for the opening of the Scabury Commemoration.* Pp. 32, 8vo. Edinburgh and London, William Blackwood and Sons.
- 1884 *The Ark's Progress to Mount Sion.* A Sermon, on 1 Chron. xiii. 6, preached at St. Mary's Church, Carlisle, before the Church Congress. Pp. 10, 8vo. London and Derby, Bemrose and Sons.
- 1884 (30 September). *What can England learn from Scotland and Ireland in Religious Matters?* A Paper read at the Carlisle Church Congress. Pp. 8, 8vo. Derby, Bemrose and Sons.
- 1885 (January). *Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism, 1552, with Mr. Gladstone's Preface.* Pp. 21, 8vo. *Scottish Church Review.*
- 1885 (April). *Shakespeare as a Teacher of Moral Duty and Religious Truth.* A popular Lecture. Pp. 23, 8vo. *Scottish Church Review.*
- 1885 (May). (Continuation). Pp. 22, 8vo. *Scottish Church Review.*
- 1885 (June). (Continuation). Pp. 17, 8vo. *Scottish Church Review.*
- 1885 (July). (Conclusion). Pp. 19, 8vo. *Scottish Church Review.*
- 1885 (3 September). *The Case of Non-Episcopal Ordination fairly considered.* Charge delivered in St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth. Pp. 19, sm. 8vo. Edinburgh, St. Giles's Printing Co.
- 1885 (2 October). *N. or M. once more.* [Defends the Explanation, 'Nicholas or Mary.'] *New York Churchman*, 24 October.
- 1885 (3 October). *St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth: Chronological Table.* Fly sheet, 4to., marked PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL.
- 1886 (25 January to 31 July). *Public Appeals on behalf of Christian Unity.* Twelve parts bound in 2 vols. sm. 8vo., paged continuously. Pp. viii + 722. Edinburgh, Macniven and Wallace.
- 1886 (21 February). '*Donec Perveniamus Omnes.*' *On the True Perspective of Christian Duty.* Address, on Eph. iv. 13, delivered in Marischall College Hall, to the Students of the University of Aberdeen. Pp. 20, sm. 8vo. Edinburgh, Macniven and Wallace.

- 1886 (20 July). *Ecclesiastical Union between England and Scotland.* Letter to the *Times*, 24 July.
- 1886 (30 August). *Ecclesiastical Union between England and Scotland.* Letter to the *Scotsman*, August 14.
- 1886 (2 September). *The Study, Use, and Value of the Book of Common Prayer.* Charge in Cathedral, Perth, with a preface in which certain criticisms on the Charge are noticed and replied to. Pp. 23, sm. 8vo. Edinburgh, St. Giles's Printing Co.
- 1886 (30 November). *The Yoke of Christ to be borne in Youth.* An Address to the Young Men's Christian Association at St. Cuthbert's, Edinburgh. Pp. 40, sm. 8vo. and wrapper. Edinburgh, Macniven and Wallace.
- 1887 (5 March). *Obstacles to Union.* [Answer to Col. Harington Stewart.] Letter to *Scottish Guardian*, 11 March, p. 112.
- 1887 (3 June). *On Church Union.* Letter to the *Scottish News*, June 6.
- 1887 (21 June). *Some Considerations on the Queen's Jubilee: an address delivered at St. Andrew's Church, St. Andrews.* *St. Leonard's School Gazette*, extra number.
- 1887 (21 June). *A Jubilee Tract for the People of Scotland, on the Christian Ministry,* with part of a sermon on *The Evangelization of the Heathen.* Pp. 12, 12mo. Perth, S. Cowan and Co.
- 1887 (18 July). *Ad Agnatam Ramsay Cantabrigiæ in classico Tripode facile principem.* (Verses, Latin and English.) *St. Leonard's School Gazette*, November.
- 1887 (1 August). *Letter on the Question of a Metropolitan* (reprinted from *Scottish Guardian* of 5 August). Pp. 12, sm. 8vo.
- 1887 (1 September). 'Church Union: Steps to promote it.' [Reply to Dr. Cunningham's Lee Lecture.] Charge in Cathedral, Perth. Pp. 24, sm. 8vo. Edinburgh, St. Giles's Printing Co.
- 1887 (December). *Ignatian Episcopacy a basis for Christian Union,* with Appendix on *St. Clement as a Witness for the Threefold Ministry.* Pp. 14, 8vo. Perth, S. Cowan and Co. (first part reprinted from *The Scots Magazine*).
- 1888 (21 January). *Pindar and Athletics, Ancient and Modern.* An address delivered to the Students of the University of St. Andrews. Pp. 24, *National Review* (April 1888).
- 1888 (April). *Ignatianism not Presbyterianism,* in answer to Principal Cunningham. Pp. 12, 8vo. Perth, S. Cowan and Co. (reprinted from *The Scots Magazine*).
- 1888 (July). *Ecclesiastical Union between England and Scotland,* a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, President of the Lambeth Conference. Pp. 44, 8vo. Edinburgh, Macniven and Wallace; London, Macmillan.

- 1888 (29 August). *The Lambeth Conference and Church Reunion*. Charge in Cathedral, Perth, with Preface and Appendix. Pp. 39, 8vo. Edinburgh, Macniven and Wallace.
- 1888 (15 November). *Concession or no Concession*. Letter to the *Scotsman*, 16 November.
- 1889 (18 April). *A threefold Rule of Christian Duty specially needed for these Times*. Commemoration Sermon, at St. Giles's Cathedral, Edinburgh. Pp. 27, 8vo. Edinburgh, Macniven and Wallace.
- 1889 (12 November). *Revision of the Scotch Communion Office*. A Charge delivered at the Diocesan Synod held at Perth. Pp. 18 + 2, sm. 8vo. Edinburgh, St. Giles's Printing Co.
- 1889 (Christmas). *Mark Antony's Friendship for Julius Cæsar*. Pp. 5, 8vo. From *Remington's Annual*.
- 1890 [October, 1889]. *The Waverley Proverbial Birthday Book*. Dedicated to Lady Rollo of Duncrub Park. Pp. 288, 16mo. London, Remington and Co.
- 1890 (18 February). *Lessons from Experience of the Past, on the Present Controversy respecting the Scottish Communion Office*. Letter to the *Scottish Guardian*, 21 February, pp. 103-105.
- 1890 *Structural Arrangement of Communion Offices*. [Present English (1552), Present Scotch] (1764), First English (1549), First Scotch (1637), with preliminary remarks and notes.] 4to, fly sheet.
- 1890 (April). *Confirmation Address* delivered at the Church of St. Columba, Crieff. Published at the request of the Incumbent, Rev. A. G. Maitland. Pp. 20, sm. 8vo. Edinburgh, St. Giles's Printing Co.
- 1890 *Series Collectarum ex Liturgiâ Anglicanâ Versibus Latinis Reddita necnon Selecti Hymni Psalmique ad Praecipuas Ecclesiæ Ferias pertinentes cum Paucis Aliis similiter versi*. Pp. 127, sm. 8vo. London, John Murray.
- 1890 (3 June). *Religious Toleration not to be confounded with Indifference to Religious Truth*. Address before the opening of the General Synod in St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh. Pp. 30, 32mo. Edinburgh, R. Grant and Son.
- 1890 (30 October). *St. Ninian's Cathedral. The General Synod of 1890*. Synodal Charge delivered in the Cathedral, Perth. Pp. 27, sm. 8vo. Edinburgh, St. Giles's Printing Co., and R. Grant and Son.
- 1890 (12 November). *St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth: Pastoral Letter*. Fly sheet, 3 pp., 4to.

- 1891 (January). *Annals of My Early Life, 1806 to 1846*. Pp. xvi + 420, 8vo. London, Longmans, Green and Co.
- 1891 (1 October). *An unspoken Speech intended for the Glenalmond Jubilee*. *Scottish Guardian*, 16 October.
- 1891 (7 October). *Charge at Diocesan Synod especially on Modern Teaching on the Canon of the Old Testament*. [See also 1892 (25 January).] *Scottish Guardian*, 9 October.
- 1892 (14 January). *The Duke of Argyll and Bishop Lightfoot*. Letter to the *Scotsman*, 16 January. Reprinted in *Scottish Guardian*, 22 January.
- 1892 (22 January). *The Duke of Argyll and Bishop Lightfoot* (second letter). *Scotsman*, 25 January. Reprinted in *Scottish Guardian*, 29 January.
- 1892 (25 January). *Primary Witness to the Truth of the Gospel*; also a *Charge on Modern Teaching on the Canon of the Old Testament* (1891). Pp. xi + 333, crown 8vo. London, Longmans, Green and Co.
- 1892 (5 October). Farewell Charge [read by the Dean in the Bishop's absence]. *Scottish Guardian*, 7 October.
- 1892 (13 October). *Apologia pro Vita Sua*. [A letter to the *Scotsman* defending his position and action in the Reunion movement.] *Scotsman*, 15 October. *Scottish Guardian*, 28 October.
- 1892 (21 November). *An Attempt to Remove Misunderstanding*. [Letter written within a fortnight of his death in reply to a speech made by a clergyman of the Diocese against his reunion policy.] *Scottish Guardian*, 25 November.
- 1892 *Shakspeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible*. Pp. xii + 420, crown 8vo. Fourth edition, revised. Eden, Remington and Co., London and Sydney.
- 1893 (March). *Annals of My Life, 1847 to 1856*. Edited by W. Earl Hodgson. Pp. xxxvi + 230, 8vo. London, Longmans, Green and Co.
- 1894 *A Plain Tract on the 'Scottish Communion Office': its History, Principles, and Advantages*. [Reprint by Rev. W. M. Meredith.] Pp. 20, 8vo. Edinburgh, St. Giles's Printing Co.
-
- 1888 *Catalogue of an extensive collection of books, including a portion of the library of Bishop Wordsworth and the . . . architectural library of . . . Hew M. Wardrop . . . to be sold by auction 16 January 1888*. 8vo. Edinburgh, Printed by Morrison and Gibb. The books were sold on 16-18 Jan. 1888, by Mr. Dowell, at 18 George Street, Edinburgh. [Bodl. 2591. d. 19 (1).]

APPENDIX VIII

CHURCHES AND PARSONAGES BUILT OR PROVIDED
DURING HIS EPISCOPATE¹

1856. [Alyth Church built.]
1857. 19 June. First stone of Birnam Church laid.
16 September. Alyth, St. Ninian's, Church consecrated.
22 September. Callander, St. Andrew's, Church consecrated.
9 November. Kirkcaldy, St. Peter's, Church consecrated.
[Bridge of Allan Church built.]
1858. 10 June. Pitlochry Church opened.
1 July. Birnam, St. Mary's, Church consecrated.
1860. 11 April. Duncrub Chapel opened.
18 August. Pitlochry, Holy Trinity, Church consecrated.
1861. 11 September. First stone of the Hall, Glenalmond College,
laid.
[Cupar-Fife, St. James's, Church enlarged.]
1863. [Kinloch-Rannoch Church built.]
1864. 29 August. Kinloch-Rannoch, All Saints', Church consecrated
[Weem, St. David's, Church built; opened 27 June 1869.]
1866. 17 May. Crieff, St. Columba's Church (the first), consecrated.
1867. 22 December. Cupar-Fife, St. James's, new church, opened.
1868. 23 August. Perth, St. Andrew's School Chapel opened.
1869. 8 April. St. Andrews, new church, opened.
11 September. Meigle, St. Margaret's, Church consecrated.
28 November. Pittenweem, St. John the Evangelist's, Church
reopened after enlargement.
1872. [Bridge of Allan, St. Saviour's, Church enlarged.]
1873. 7 September. Callander, St. Andrew's, chancel consecrated.
1874. 26 August. Cromlix, private chapel, opened.
4 October. Kinross new Church opened.
1875. [Strath-tay Iron-Church built.]
1876. 1 July. Culross, St. Serf's, Church consecrated.
[2 July. Killin Iron-Church opened.]

¹ I fear that this list is not complete, notwithstanding the kind help of Archdeacon Aglen and Rev. Canon J. W. Hunter, the Synod Clerk. Most of the entries are from the Bishop's own almanacks. Those in [brackets] are supplied from other sources.

1876. 19 November. Kirkcaldy, St. Peter's, Church reopened.
3 December. Burntisland, new chapel, opened.
1877. 2 August. Crieff, St. Columba's Church (the second) consecrated.
30 November. St. Andrews, St. Andrew's, Church consecrated.
1878. 29 August. Doune, St. Modoc's, Church (near Dunblane) consecrated.
19 October. Weem Church, St. David's, consecrated.
[Taymouth (Kenmore), private chapel, opened.]
1881. 30 August. Leven, St. Margaret's of Scotland, Church consecrated.
4 October. Kinross, St. Paul's, Church consecrated.
27 October. Forfar, St. John's, Church consecrated.
1882. 6 July. Dollar, St. James the Great's, Church consecrated.
1883. 29 June. [Birnam, St. Mary's, enlarged; N. aisle consecrated.]
1884. 5 August. Comrie, St. Fillan's, Church opened.
1887. 28 April. [Newport-on-Tay, St. Mary's, Church consecrated.]
1889. 25 May. Dunfermline, Masterton Chapel, St. Margaret's, consecrated.
1890. 7 August. Perth, St. Ninian's Cathedral, nave, consecrated.
[Pitlochry Church enlarged a second time.]
1891. 24 September. Dunfermline, Holy Trinity, Church consecrated.

During this period eighteen parsonages were built or provided. I give the names and dates as far as I can learn them:—Alyth (about 1862), Birnam (1872), Blairgowrie (1866), Bridge of Allan (about 1858), Callander (1872), Coupar-Angus (1887), Crieff (1868), Cupar-Fife (1856), Dollar (1888), Dunfermline (about 1885), Forfar (1856 and 1866), Kinross, Kirkcaldy (1856), Leven (1887), Perth St. Ninian's (Provost's House), Perth St. John's (1857), Pitlochry (1866), Strath-tay (1866). A chaplain's house was also provided at Glamis Castle.

Memus mentioned on p. 193 is a hamlet in the parish of Tannadice, Forfarshire. Canon Hunter infers from the old Diocesan Minute-book that there was either a congregation at Memus served by the priest in charge of Cortachy, or that he had his residence there. Meetings of clergy of the District or Diocese of Dunkeld were held there 15 November 1743, and 30 April 1745. The Rev. John Ramsay 'of Memus' died in 1756. Cortachy appears to have been united to Kirriemuir about that date. I much regret to have to record the death of my kind friend Canon Douglas on 13 March 1899. He had been Incumbent of Kirriemuir since 1851.

APPENDIX IX

THE BISHOP'S FAMILY

Charles Wordsworth, b. 22 August 1806 ; m. 1st (29 December 1835), *Miss Charlotte Day*, daughter of Rev. George Day, Rector of Earsham, near Bungay, Norfolk, by whom he had one daughter, *Charlotte Emmeline*, b. 10 May 1839, who became a member of the Community of the Sisters of the Church (Kilburn), and is now a member of the Sisterhood of the Ascension residing at Bury, Lancashire. Mrs. Wordsworth died on the day her daughter was born.

M. 2nd (28 October 1846), *Miss Katharine Mary Barter* (b. 21 October 1828), eldest daughter of Rev. William Brudenell Barter, Rector of Highclere and Burghclere, Hants, by whom he had five sons and seven daughters. He died 5 December 1892. She died 23 April 1897. The issue of this marriage was :

1. *Charles Samuel*, b. 30 March 1848, educated at Trinity College, Glenalmond, and at Winton Lodge, Clifton, and a scholar of Winchester College (1860-1866), at University Coll., Oxford (3rd Cl. Mod., 4th Cl. Lit. Hum.); B.A. 1870, M.A. 1879; ordained Deacon 1871, Priest 1872, Dio. Rochester; Curate of Romford 1871-3, Kidderminster 1873-8; Rector of Old Swinford, Worcestershire, 1878-92; m. Emily, daughter of Rev. Charles Craufurd, sometime Rector of Old Swinford, 17 April 1879; and has issue, Charles William, b. 19 February 1880, elected to an exhibition at Trinity College, Cambridge, 1898; Christopher Robert, b. 18 October 1881; Emily Constance, b. 28 January 1883; John Craufurd, b. 14 April 1885; Andrew Gordon, b. 25 July 1886; Geoffrey Herbert, b. 11 November 1888; Dorothy, b. 5 October 1889.

2. *Robert Walter*, b. at St. Andrews 30 July 1849, educated at Trinity College, Glenalmond (Easter 1858 to Christmas 1860), at Winton Lodge, Clifton (1861 to Midsummer, 1862), a Commoner of Winchester College (Midsummer 1862 to Midsummer 1868); became agent to Earl Manvers, 13 May 1883; m. Blanche Amelia, daughter of Sir Robert Turing, Bart. 14 July 1886, and has issue, Blanche Katharine, b. 17 May 1887; Robert James, b. 28 July 1888.

3. *William Barter*, *b.* at St. Andrews, 4 August 1850, educated at Trinity College Glenalmond, and at Somersetshire College, Bath; chosen Branch Manager of Lloyds Bank, Lichfield, 17 December 1877.

4. *Katharine Mary*, *b.* at Glenalmond, 19 March 1852.

5. *Kenneth Andrew*, *b.* at Glenalmond, 12 May 1853; *d.* at Trinity College, Glenalmond, as a schoolboy, 16 May 1862.

6. *Margaret Walker*, *b.* at Glenalmond, 16 April 1854 (Easter Day); *m.* at Rydal, M. C. Macdonald, Esq., 7 August 1889 (he *d.* 3 January 1890); she *d.* 1 November 1895.

7. *Emily Sarah*, *b.* 24 July 1856, at Pitcullen Bank, Perth. The author of this memoir has received much assistance from her in its compilation. She now resides at St. Andrews.

8. *Edith Louisa*, *b.* 17 September 1857, at Pitcullen Bank.

9. *Mary Barbara*, *b.* 24 April 1859 (Easter Day), at the Feu House, Perth. Resides at University Hall, St. Andrews.

10. *Louisa Caroline*, *b.* 19 April 1861, in Melville Street, Edinburgh, *d.* 5 April 1894.

11. *John Roundell*, *b.* 14 February 1866 (Ash Wednesday), at the Feu House, Perth; educated at Glenalmond and New College, Oxford; 2nd Lieut. 2nd Batt. North Staffordshire (98th) Regt. 8 January 1890; *d.* 14 April 1890.

12. *Harriet Susan*, *b.* 26 September 1868, at the Feu House, Perth; *m.* John Stirling, Esq., of Muiravonside, Linlithgow, 18 July 1895.

INDEX

ABERNETHY

- ABERNETHY, 29
 Aglen, Ven. A. S., made archdeacon, 268; help from, Preface vii, 386
 Alexander Lycurgus, Archbishop of Syra and Tenos, 210
 'Altar,' use of the word, 13, 68, 109, 347, 351, 360, 361
 Ambrose, St., 10 *n.*, 69
 Anacharsis, quoted, 309
 Andrewes, Bishop, on reception by the wicked, 71; on the priest's attitude in receiving, 93 *n.*; eucharistic teaching, 117, 122; on Melchizedek, 140; on adoration, 145; on non-episcopal churches, 243
 Andrews, St. *See* St. Andrews
 Aquinas, St. Thomas, doctrine of supra-local presence, 91; on Eucharistic sacrifice, 137
 Archbishop, title of, 24, 25, 27, 189, 251, 383
 Archibald, Rev. John, 'Historic Episcopate in the Columban Church,' referred to, 151, 155, 173
 Ardoch, camps at, x, 28
 Argyll, Duke of, at Ballachulish, 227
 Arnold, Thomas, D.D., late ordination as priest, 3
 Atkinson, Thomas, Bishop of North Carolina, at Inverness, 173
 Attendance, at communion, of those who do not communicate, 99, 118, 125, 127
 Auchterarder, mission at, 66, 193
 Augustine, St., on Eucharistic sacrifice, 93, 116, 140 *n.*
- BALL, T. J., Provost of Cumbræ, characters of Provost Fortescue and Canon Humble, 46-50
 Baptism, Presbyterian, 58 f., 62 f.

BOYD

- Baptism, ministry of, 60 f.
 Barry, Alfred, Bishop of Sydney and Primate of Australia, on validity of Presbyterian orders, 255; on Lambeth Conference Committee, 256, 257; letter from, App. VII., 363-66
 Barter, Miss Katharine Mary, married to Charles Wordsworth, 4-5. *See* Wordsworth
 Barter, Miss Mary, Preface vii.; helps in 'Biography in Scotichronicon,' 108, 191, 375; index to book on Shakespeare, 169 *n.*; letter to, on visit to Gladstone, 210; on last Charge, 275
 Barter, Rev. Charles, of Cornworthy, 121 *n.*
 Barter, Rev. Charles, of Sarsden, 121 *n.*, 191
 Barter, Rev. R. S., Warden of Winchester, 3; death and character of, 180, 181-83
 Barter, Rev. Wm. B., 5; letter on the Synodal letter of 1858, 110; death and character, 121
 Baxter, R., criticism of, 316
 Benediction, service of, 91
 Benson, Edward White, Archbishop of Canterbury, 205, 235, 253, 255-56, 360 f.
 Beveridge, William, Bishop of St. Asaph, 145
 Bingham, Rev. Joseph, 'Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism,' 63 *n.*
 Birnam, Dunkeld, 80, 81, 192, 386-7
 Bishops and Presbyters possibly one order, 232, cp. 261
 Bisset, Rev. Dr., remarkable address as Moderator, 154, 157
 Boyd, Very Rev. A. K. H., D.D., 222-299

BOYLE

- Boyle, G. D., Dean of Salisbury, Preface vii; letters to, 316-18; inscription on his book-case, 324; on date of 'Guy Mannering,' 362
- Boyle, Hon. G. F. (Earl of Glasgow), promoter of St. Ninian's, 51; accepts new statutes, 52 f., 126; his gifts and influence, 127; concurs in appointment of Provost Rorison, 265; his failure, 265
- Bramhall, John, Archbishop of Armagh, on Eucharistic sacrifice, 118; on non-episcopal churches, 243; on Presbyterian orders, 262 and *n.*
- Bright, William, D.D., Canon of Christchurch, 100 *n.*; quoted, 62 *n.*
- Browne, Harold, Bishop of Winchester, letter from, 239
- Buckeridge, Bishop, 'idem sacrificatum,' 69 *n.*
- Burton, John, Provost of St. Ninian's, 198 f., 202, 204; changes accepted by, 264; death, 265
- CAMPBELL, Rev. G., minister of Eastwood, 223
- Campbell, Professor Lewis, 222, 287, 296, 297, 303
- Campbell, Rev. R., 45, 125
- Carpenter, William Boyd, Bishop of Ripon, preaches in College Chapel, St. Andrews, 235; letter and sonnet to Charles Wordsworth, 333
- Canning, Lord, early pupil of Charles Wordsworth, 2
- Chambers, Rev. J. Charles, share in Bishop Torry's Prayer Book, 10, 13, 15
- Chambers, J. D., Recorder of Salisbury, opinion on St. Ninian's statutes, 127
- Cheyne, Rev. Patrick (Aberdeen), 'Six Sermons,' 102-6; presented by Dr. Rorison, 106; summoned, 107; condemned and suspended, 115; first appeal, 119, 122; charged with disobeying sentence, 123; second appeal and sentence, 123 f., 131; restoration, 124
- Chinnery-Haldane, J. R. Alexander, Bishop of Argyll and the Isles, 59 *n.*
- Chrysostom, St., on Eucharistic sacrifice, 93, 116

EDEN

- 'Church Service Society,' 223, 224
- Clarendon, Lord, criticism of, 316
- Claughton, Thomas Legh, Bishop of Rochester and St. Albans, his consecration, 174, 185; letters from, 191, 203; verses addressed to on operation for cataract, 324; golden wedding, 325
- Comrie, mission at, 66; sermon at consecration of St. Fillan's Church, 334, 381, 387
- Confirmation, how far necessary to Presbyterian converts, 63 and *n.*; the Bishop's administration of, 336; card, 337, 357 f.
- Cooper, James, D.D., of Aberdeen, now Professor at Glasgow, 223 *n.*, 284
- Cosin, John, Bishop of Durham, on the eucharistic sacrifice, 137 *n.*
- DANSON, Rev. J. Myers, D.D., 32, 123 *n.*; preaches in College Chapel, St. Andrews, 235 *n.*; estimate of Charles Wordsworth, 280 foll.; criticism of his sermons, 335
- Day, Miss Charlotte, married to Charles Wordsworth, 2-3; death, 3
- De Dominis, Archbishop, M.A., 90 *n.*
- De Tassy, Professor Garcin, 147
- Disraeli, Benjamin (Earl of Beaconsfield), verses to, 290 foll.; letter from, 294
- Douglas, Canon James J., of Kirriemuir, vii, 7, 387
- Dowden, John, Bishop of Edinburgh, election and consecration, 246-47; letter to, on lecture at St. Cuthbert's, 247, 248, 279; custom in confirmation, 345 *n.*; quoted, 75 *n.*, 346 *n.*, 348
- Drummond, William Abernethy, Bishop of Brechin, Edinburgh and Glasgow, cited, 132
- Dunblane, 28
- Duncrub Castle, 153, 192, 386
- Dundee, sermon on Philadelphia at St. Paul's, 334, 379
- Dunfermline, 29, 387
- Dunkeld, 28, 80: *see* Birnam
- EASTWARD or other position of celebrant, 9 *n.*, 125, 129, 205, 361
- Eden, Robert, Bishop of Moray and Ross, retires from candidature at

ELWIN

- St. Andrews, 6; in Eucharistic controversy joins Charles Wordsworth in a 'Statement,' 100; moves adoption of 'Synodal Letter,' 110; did not join in final condemnation of Cheyne, 124; joins in censure of Bishop Forbes, 134; chosen Primus, 150; character and work of, 151; helps in removal of disabilities, 155; founds Inverness Cathedral, 173; letter about archbishopric of St. Andrews, 189; congratulates Charles Wordsworth on his 'Conference,' 193; bad health and death, 246; friendly relations with Charles Wordsworth, 268
- Elwin, Rev. Warwick, 'The Minister of Baptism,' 58 *n.*, 63 *n.*
- Episcopacy, in Scotland, early, 21-23; in Galloway, 22; Glasgow, 23 *n.*; north of the Forth, 23; at St. Andrews, 23-25; Dunkeld, 25; Dunblane, 25; in the three dioceses, 26; weakness of Nonjurors, 27
- Eucharist, Charles Wordsworth's doctrine of, in 'Three Short Sermons,' 9 *f.*, 66 *fol.*, 75
- Eucharistic controversy, beginnings of (1853), 66. *See* Cheyne, Forbes, 'Scottish Office,' Wordsworth (Charles), § III., and the whole of Chapter IV.
- 'Euchologion,' 223. *See* Church Service Society
- 'Euodias (—a) and Syntyche,' 159, 177, 178, 376
- Eutyches, heresy of, 71 *n.*
- Ewing, Alexander, Bishop of Argyll and the Isles, part in Eucharistic controversy, 98, 100; abstains from voting against Cheyne, 120 *f.*; absent when Cheyne was finally condemned, 124; and when Forbes was censured, 134; helps the removal of disabilities, 155; preaches in University Church, Glasgow, 197; his death, 207; affectionate relation to Charles Wordsworth, 268
- FALCONER, Bishop William, introduces change into Scottish Office, 74; Primus, 156
- Farquhar, Canon George T., 'Episcopal History of Perth,' 9, 42, 43,

FORTESCUE

- 44, 52, 53; becomes 'Super-numerary' of the diocese and Canon, 265; his filial relation to the Bishop, *ib.*; assists him with his books, 253; verses to, 267; extracts from his 'Diary,' 271, 275; estimate of the Bishop's work, 282; scene in his library, &c., 318; on his preaching, 336
- Field, Frederick, D.D., on Revised New Testament, 212
- Forbes, Bishop A. P., of Brechin, dissents from condemnation of Torry's Prayer Book, 13; consecrates St. Ninian's, Perth, 42; character of his rule, 49; on Presbyterian Baptism, 68; primary Charge, 84-94; reasons for alarm at, 95 *f.*; relations with Charles Wordsworth, 97; comments on Cheyne's 'Six Sermons,' 103; second and third editions of Charge, 107; criticised in Synodal Letter, 108, 109; judicial proceedings in prospect, 113, 130; Keble's relation to, 108, 115, 133; letter to Congregation of St. Paul's, Dundee, 131; theological defence, 133; judgment on, 134-35; candidate for office of Primus, 150; later intercourse with Charles Wordsworth, 171; anxiety about his theology, 197-98; death, 207
- Forbes, Rev. George H. (of Burntisland), and Ep. Torry's Prayer Book, 11, 13, 15; and 'Scottish Office,' 76, 77; approves Charles Wordsworth's 'Opinion' on his brother's case, 136; used the phrase 'Real Absence,' 146
- Forbes, Lord, proposer of St. Ninian's Cathedral, 42; his gifts, 127, 265
- Forbes, Professor James D., appointed Principal of St. Andrews, 147
- Forbes, Professor John, of Corse, 122
- Forbes, Bishop Robert, of Ross, introduces change into 'Scottish Office,' 74
- Forbes, Bishop William, of Edinburgh, 95, 145
- Forfar, 29, 33, 208, 265
- Fortescue, E. B. K. (Provost of St. Ninian's), did not vote at election to Bishopric, 7; election as

FRASER

Provost, 45; character and personality, 46 f.; resignation, 48
Fraser, Dr. Campbell, letter from, 249

GALT, 'Annals of the Parish,' 35
Geste, Bishop of Salisbury, 88
Gladstone, William Ewart, early pupil of Charles Wordsworth, 2; brings Charles Wordsworth to Glenalmond, 4; at consecration of its Chapel, 5; difference of Charles Wordsworth with, 16; Mr. McColl's letter to, 123 n.; Irish Church Bill, 190, 191; Charles Wordsworth visits, 210; at jubilee of Trinity College, Glenalmond, 271; Charles Wordsworth quotes him on Wolfian theory about Homer, 272; as an athlete, letter on, 312; letter of, on Charles Wordsworth's Latin verse, 323
Glamis Castle, 29
Glenalmond and 'Ian Maclaren,' 35

Glenalmond, Trinity College, founded, 4; Wardenship of, 5; resigned in 1854, 6, 9, 16, 17; dis-severed from Diocese of St. Andrews, 81; removal of Divinity students, 208-9; Jubilee of, 271

Golf, 303, 103

Goode, William, Dean of Ripon, on the Eucharist, 83 n.

Gott, John, Bishop of Truro, pupil of Charles Wordsworth at Winchester, 4

Gray, Robert, Bishop of Capetown, at first Lambeth Conference, 176 f.; on Dutch Reformed Clergy, 243

Grub, Dr. George, the historian, advocate of Cheyne, 119 n.; quoted, 22 n., 24 n., 25 n., 27 n., 29 n.

HAMILTON, John, Archbishop of St. Andrews, murdered, 25 n.; his Catechism, 240

Hamilton, Walter Kerr, Bishop of Salisbury, early pupil of Charles Wordsworth, 2; death, 197; his character and generosity, 183-85, 339; Sermon on, 211, 279

Haskoll, Rev. Joseph, Sacristan of St. Ninian's, 45

Hodgson, W. Earl, vi, vii, 310-12, 385

KEN

Hodson, Rev. S. B., 264-5
Holgate, Clifford Wyndham, help in bibliography of early writings, 367-8

Hook, W. F., Dean of Chichester, his experience at Leeds, 17; letter from, 178

Hooker, Richard, on Presbyterian Baptism, 58; on Eucharistic presence, 89 n.; on non-episcopal churches, 243, 255

Horsley, Samuel, Bishop of St. Davids and Rochester, a friend of the Scottish Church, 31, 175

Humble, Henry, Canon and Precen-tor of St. Ninian's, account of, 48 f.; pamphlet attacking the Bishop, 130; presents Bishop to Episcopal Synod, 200; further conflict, 205; death, 206

Hunter, Canon J. W., of Birnam, help given by, Preface vii. and 84, 386-7

INNES, George, Bishop of Brechin, cited, 132

Inverness Cathedral, Bishop Eden's work, 151; foundation of, 173; constitution of Chapter, 126 n.

JEBB, Rev. John, Canon of Hereford, 53

Jermyn, Hugh Willoughby, Bishop of Colombo, appointed Bishop of Brechin (1875), 207; made Primus (1886), 246

Johnston, Very Rev. N., made Dean, 234; death of, 268; verses to, 304

Jolly, Alexander, Bishop of Moray, 69, 132, 150; anecdote of, 178, 281

KEBLE, Rev. John, 'on Eucharistic Adoration,' 86; 'Christian Year,' presence 'not in the hands,' &c., 89; on assisting at Holy Communion, 99 and n.; intervenes in the Eucharistic controversy, 101, 108; 'Considerations,' 114 f.; writes on Mr. Barter's death, 122; helps Forbes' Defence, 133; interview with Charles Wordsworth, 133; later intercourse with, 172; cp. 313
Kellach, Bishop, in 906, 23

Ken, Bishop Thomas, cautious Eucharistic doctrine, 89 n., 132;

KILRYMONT

- cited by A. P. Forbes, 131; three hymns translated by Charles Wordsworth, 314. See App. VII. (1845), 368
- Kilrymont, 252
- Kinross, 30
- Kirriemuir, 387
- LATERAN Canon on Transubstantiation, 68
- Laud, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, his epitaph, 287
- Lee, Rev. Robert, D.D., 153, 154, 155, 163
- Lees, Rev. Dr. Cameron, letter from, 249
- Leighton, Robert, Bishop of Dunblane and Archbishop of Glasgow, 26, 29, 156, 160, 203
- Lendrum, Rev. Alexander, part in Bishop Torry's Prayer Book, 10, 11, 13, 15; resigns Muthill, 64; his opposition to Bishop, 129, 130; retirement, 131
- Lewis, Sir G. C., 147
- Liddon, Canon H. P., 245-6
- Lock, Walter, Warden of Keble College, 'John Keble,' 114 *n.*
- Longley, Archbishop, at Inverness, 173; calls Lambeth Conference, 176, 177, 187
- Lothian, Marquess of, 238
- Lytelton, Edward, on athletics, 308 *f.*
- Lyon, Rev. C. J., Incumbent of St. Andrews, his pressure upon Wordsworth to vote, 6 *n.*; his 'History of St. Andrews' quoted, 24 *n.*
- MACGREGOR, Rev. Dr. (St. Cuthbert's, Edinburgh), invitation from, 245, 247, 248; verses to, 304
- Mackey, Rev. Donald J., Memoir of Bishop Forbes, 85 *n.*, 100 *n.*, 155 *n.*; becomes Canon of St. Ninian's, 264; resigns, 265
- Macleod, Rev. Norman, D.D., 154
- Manning, Henry Edward (Cardinal), early pupil of Charles Wordsworth, 2; renewal of intercourse with, 312 *f.*
- Medwyn, Lord (father of Bishop A. P. Forbes), 89
- Melville, Rev. Henry, on Christ pleading His Sacrifice, 138 *n.*
- Meikle, 73, 192, 386
- Meredith, Rev. W. M., vii, 65

PALMER

- Metropolitan, on question of a, 251: see Archbishop
- Milligan, Rev. Dr., of Aberdeen, x, 216 *n.*, 225-7, 277
- Moberly, George, Bishop of Salisbury, 3, 211, 232, 287; translation of Pindar, 309; golden wedding, 324
- Moir, David, Bishop of Brechin, his Eucharistic teaching, 132
- Munns, H. T., portrait of Charles Wordsworth (1882), the frontispiece to this volume, xxvi, 233
- Muthill, Charles Wordsworth at, 64 *f.*, 73; an old centre, 33
- NEALE, John Mason, D.D., offered Provostship of St. Ninian's, 45; life of Bishop Torry quoted, 11 *n.*, 14 *n.*, 41 *n.*, 51 *n.*
- Nestorianism, charge of, against the 'Six Bishops' Pastoral,' 115, 145
- Nicholas, Bishop of Dunkeld, consecrates cloister and cemetery of New College, 309 *f.*
- Newman, John Henry, Cardinal, renewal of intercourse with, 312, 314; judgment on, 314 *f.*, 318; Charles Wordsworth's translation of 'Lead, kindly Light,' 332
- Non-communicating or non-recipient attendance, 99, 118, 125, 127
- Nonjurors, Charles Wordsworth on, 229
- Novatians, their baptism admitted, their orders questioned, 62 *n.*, 253, 256
- OSMINGTON, Dorset, 288, 342
- Oxenham, Rev. F. N., reprint of Waterland's 'Letters on Lay-Baptism,' 59 *n.*
- Oxford movement, Charles Wordsworth's relation to, 3
- PALMER, Ven. Edwin, Archdeacon of Oxford, on Revision, 215
- Palmer, Roundell, Earl of Selborne, opinion on right of Episcopal Synod to issue a Pastoral, 113; correspondence on Establishment, 194-95; 'Rector' of St. Andrews, 304; character of Charles Wordsworth, 338; letter to, on his Family Memorials, 339 *f.*; helped Charles Wordsworth's election to Winchester Fellowship, 342

PALMER

- Palmer, Rev. Wm., 11, 82; character of, 339
- Pannonius, Janus, a Hungarian Bishop, 288
- Pirie, Rev. Dr., Principal of Aberdeen, 157
- Perth, in Diocese of St. Andrews, 41 *n.*; fine situation of, 23, 28, 40-41; Canon Farquhar's 'Episcopal History of' quoted, 19, 42, 43, 44, 52, 53, 276; churches at, 56; St. Andrew's School Chapel founded (1866), 170, 375, 376, 377
- Presbyterianism, strong points of, 33 foll., 161, 222, 231, 242
- Primate, title of, 251 and 252 *n.*
- Primus, Bishop Terrot's resignation and election of Bishop Eden to office of, 150; election of Bishop (Jermyn) of Brechin, 246; proposed change of name to Primate, 251 *f.*
- Pusey, Rev. Edward Bouverie, D.D., 17, 86, 87 *n.*, 105 *n.*, 108, 109; helps Forbes, 133, 134; Charles Wordsworth's breach with, 135; character of, 340
- RAMSAY, Miss Agnata (Mrs. M. Butler), 301 *f.*
- Rattray, Thomas, Bishop of Dunkeld, 26, 281
- Ridding, George, Bishop of Southwell, testimony to Charles Wordsworth, 4
- Roberts, Rev. Dr., of St. Andrews, on disunion, 248; on Revised Version, 212
- Rollo, Lord, Preface vii., 66; readiness to help Reunion Conference, 158; promotes memorial to the Bishop, 266
- Rollo, Lady, Waverley birthday book dedicated to, 384
- Rorison, Rev. Gilbert, D.D., of Peterhead, presents Mr. Cheyne, 106; effort at reunion, 158
- Rorison, Very Rev. V. L., Provost (Dean) of St. Ninian's, 265, 267
- Ross, A. J., Memoir of Bishop Ewing, 85, 120, 124, 155
- 'SACERDOTALISM,' note on, 219
- Sage, John, Bishop, 'Principles of the Cyprianic Age,' 112 *n.*
- St. Andrews, City and University of,

SCOTTISH OFFICE

- 28, 207, 221 foll., 273, 381, 297-304; degree, 233; preaching at, 234 foll.; burial at, 278 foll.; use of hood, 337
- St. Andrews, Diocese of, *see* Chap. II. 23-39: title dropped and resumed, 27, cp. 32 *n.*; interest of, 28 foll.; character of the people, 31, 34 foll. *See* Wordsworth (Charles), § II. B.
- St. John's Town = Perth, 56
- St. Ninian's Cathedral, early history of, 42; constitution, 43-45; chapter of, 45; new statutes of, 52 *f.*; building, 55 *f.*; used by Charles Wordsworth, 81, 118; strained relations with, 119; open rupture, 124; reasonable fears concerning, 125; interpretation of Statutes, 126 foll.; 'Cathedral Declaration' and withdrawal of Bishop, 128 *f.*; renewed trouble under Provost Burton (1871 onwards), 198-202; *modus vivendi* (1874), 204; happier relations (1878 onwards), 264 foll.; Lord Glasgow's failure (1885), 265; Provost Rorison's success, enlargement of Cathedral, 265 foll.; recognised by Canon, 266, 270; Canon Farquhar's good work, 265, 267; Bishop's satisfaction with Cathedral, 266. *See also* Wordsworth (Charles), § III.
- Scone, 23, 41, 42
- 'Scotiechronicon,' Memoir of Charles Wordsworth in, 108, 191, 375
- Scott, Major Hugh, of Gala, editor of 'Scottish Guardian,' 159; letter to, on Keble memorial, 172
- Scott, Sir Walter, on Perthshire, 21, 28, 35; Waverley novels in chronological order, 362; Waverley Birthday Book (1890), 384
- 'Scottish Church,' title adopted in 1890, 252 *n.*
- 'Scottish Church Society,' foundation of, 277
- 'Scottish Office,' used at Glenalmond alternately with English, 9; references to, 67; its character, 73; peculiar feature of, 74; Charles Wordsworth on, 75-80; in General Synod of 1862-3, 77; G. Forbes' defence of, 77; possible revision of, 78

SELLAR

- Sellar, Rev. J. A., 45, 55, 119
 Selwyn, Bishop G. A., 308
 Shakespeare, works on, 168-70
 Shaw, Rev. W. G., of Forfar, 108 *n.* ; character and death, 208, 265
 Short, T. V., Bishop of St. Asaph, 71
 Skating, 2, 311, 312
 Skinner, John, Bishop of Aberdeen and Primus, cited, 132, 318
 Skinner, R., Incumbent of St. Andrews, 160
 Skinner, William, Bishop of Aberdeen, his character, 318
 Smythe, Mr., of Methven, 193 ; family of, 317
 Sprott, Rev. Dr., 232
 Stanley, Arthur Penrhyn, D.D., on 'Euodias and Syntyche,' 178 ; 'the Burning Bush,' 218 ; on priestly charisma, 219 ; friendship and co-operation with, 286, 288 ; translated lines to Dean Ramsay, 289 *f.* ; and Lord Beaconsfield, 292 *f.* ; 'Beaumont and Fletcher,' 294 ; his 'valediction,' 295
 Stewart, two brothers, gift to Charles Wordsworth, 132 *n.*
 Stewart, House of, memorials at Dunfermline and Kinross, 30
 Story, R. H., D.D., 'Life of Robert Lee,' 153 *n.* ; joins Church Service Society, 223 ; lecture on Church history, 228
 Suther, T. G., Bishop of Aberdeen, candidate for Bishopric of St. Andrews, 6 ; accepts presentation of Mr. Cheyne, 106 ; condemns and suspends him, 115 ; finds him guilty of disobedience, 123 ; withdraws his suspension, 124 ; opinion on Presbyterian orders, 259
 Sutton, Charles Manners (Archbishop of Canterbury), sponsor to Charles Wordsworth, 2
 Synod, General (now Provincial), of Scottish Church, its rare meetings, 149 ; constitution, 149 *n.* ; meetings of 1862-3, 151 ; of 1876, establishes representative Church Council, 194, 208-10 ; of 1890, its enactments, 269-70
 Synod, Episcopal, of Scottish Church, powers of, in censuring, 113 ; relation to General Synod, 149 ; meetings of on Prayer Book (1850),

TORRY

- 13 ; on Forbes' Charge (1857), 97, 98, and (1858) 108-10 ; Cheyne's appeals (1858), 122-24 ; on Forbes, 133-34 ; move for General Synod (1859), 149 ; for election of Primus (1862), 150-51 ; on laymen in Synods (1869), 193 and (1873) 194 ; presentment by Mr. Humble (1873), 200 ; preparation for General Synod (1875), 208 ; for election of Primus (1886), 246
 'Synod,' in Established Church of Scotland, 34 ; Synod of Lothian, R. Lee's speech at, 153
 TAYLOR, Jeremy, cited by A. P. Forbes, 131 ; by Charles Wordsworth, 132 ; commendation of a section of his 'Ductor Dubitantium,' 71 *f.*
 Tennyson, Alfred, Lord, his prize-poem, 322
 Terrot, Charles Hughes, Bishop of Edinburgh, joins in 'declaration' on Eucharist, 100 ; absent from Cheyne's first trial, 119-20 ; presides at second, 123 ; resignation as Primus, 150 ; death, 150, 197
 Tertullian, on lay baptism, 61
 Theodoret on Eucharist, 116-17
 Torry, Patrick, Bishop of St. Andrews, his Prayer Book, 10-13, and App. I., 345-9 ; his relation to his Diocese, 14 ; determined attitude towards the Episcopal College, 15 ; orders dismissal of non-communicants, 15 ; helps to found St. Ninian's Cathedral, 42-45 ; doctrine on Eucharist, 132, 136, 137 *n.*
 Torry, John, Dean of the Diocese, votes for Charles Wordsworth, 7 ; relation to Bishop Torry's Prayer Book, 10, 13 ; letter from Charles Wordsworth on his proposed resignation (1863), 152 ; forwards address about St. Ninian's, 202 ; various circulars addressed to, 202 ; letter from Charles Wordsworth on his resignation (1874), 203 ; on postponement of, 204 ; his death, 234
 Trower, Walter John, Bishop of Glasgow : much opposed to Bishop

TULLOCH

- A. P. Forbes, 98, 100, 109 *n.*, 114; eager in Eucharistic controversy, joins in 'Declaration,' 100; attack on Dr. Bright, 100 *n.*; 'Pastoral,' 114; retirement, 124 *n.*
 Tulloch, John, D.D., Principal of St. Mary's, St. Andrews, 153, 154, 160 ('A Plea for Justice'); friendship with Charles Wordsworth, 222-23; elegy on, 300 f.

UBIQUITY, reference to, in 'Black Rubric,' 91; controversy on, 141

- WALFORD, J. D., Mathematical Master at Winchester, 168
 Walker, Dean W., of Monymusk, 100 *n.*, 119 *n.*, 150 *n.*
 Waterland, on Lay-Baptism, 59
 Weem, 192, 378, 386-7
 Will, Dr. and Mrs. Ogilvie, 238
 Williams, J., Bishop of Connecticut, letter on disloyal clergy, 199-200; on the book on the 'Christian Ministry,' 218; at Seabury Commemoration, 238
 Williams, Rev. Isaac, 72
 Wilson, Very Rev. John Skinner, Dean of Edinburgh, 268
 Wilson, Thomas, Bishop of Sodor and Man, cited by A. P. Forbes, 131; cautious language on the Eucharistic presence, 132
 Wilson, Wm. Scott, Bishop of Glasgow, in Cheyne case, 123; reads finding in Forbes' case, 134
 WORDSWORTH, CHARLES, subject of this Memoir:—

The principal references are collected under the following heads or sections:—

§ I. *External and domestic events. Character.*

§ II. *Episcopal work in Scotland. A. General. B. Diocesan.*

§ III. *The Eucharistic Controversy and St. Ninian's Cathedral.*

§ IV. *Reunion work.*

§ V. *Public work in England.*

§ VI. *Literary work (general): A. Theological. B. Secular. C. Judgments on men and books.*

§ VII. *Verses by.*

WORDSWORTH

§ I. *External and domestic events.*

Early life (1806-35), 1-2; Second Master of Winchester (1835-46), 3-4; father's death (1846), 4; Warden of Glenalmond (1847-54), 4-6; circumstances of his election as Bishop of St. Andrews (1852), 6-8; his claims on Churchmen, 9; reasons for opposition to, 10-17; condemnation of Bishop Torry's Prayer Book, 10, 14; strong views on Establishment, 15; opposition to W. E. Gladstone, 16; opposed by Tractarian party, 17; his consecration as Bishop (25 Jan. 1853), 5; his character, 18-20; mottos in almanacks, 21, 40, 81, 290; interest in the Scottish people, 31 foll.; resigns Glenalmond (1854), 6; visits to England, 40; lodges at Perth, 40; first Synods, 51; enthronement, 55; primary Charge (1854), 56; takes charge of Muthill (1854-55), 64 f.; 'Three Sermons on Holy Communion,' 67 foll.; move to Birnam Cottage, Dunkeld (1855), 80; after three years finds a home at Pitcullen Bank, Perth (1856), 81; settles for nineteen years at the Feu House, Perth (1858-76), 82; his taste in architecture and gardening, terrace walk at the Feu, 82; name put forward for Principalship of St. Andrews (1859), 147; death and character of Warden Barter (1861), 180, 181-83; death of Kenneth Wordsworth (1862), 180 foll.; disappointment as to office of Primus (1862), 150; objects to canon of General Synod (1863), 151; offers his resignation, 152; success of his Greek Grammar, 167; Bishop Hamilton's generosity, 183 foll.; correspondence with Roundell Palmer on 'Establishment,' 194-96; Christopher Wordsworth made Bishop of Lincoln (1869), 196 foll.; visit to Seaton, 197; death of Bishop Hamilton (1 Aug. 1869), 197; made Fellow of Winchester College (1871), 197, 342; death of Bishop Ewing (1873),

WORDSWORTH

207; announces his resignation (1874), 203; postpones and finally drops it, 204; death of W. G. Shaw, of Forfar (1874), 207; removal of Glenalmond divinity students to Edinburgh, 209; death of Bishop A. P. Forbes (1875), 207; of Canon Humble (1876), 206; removal to 'Bishop's Hall' or 'Bishopshall,' St. Andrews (1876), 207, 221-22; lines for summer-house at, 287; happier residence at St. Andrews, 222; takes up reunion work again (1879), 224; death of Dean Torry and appointment of Johnston (1879-80), 234 *n.*; letter from 'A Son of Toil' (1881), 229 *f.*; portrait painted by H. T. Munns (1882), 233; honorary D.D. of St. Andrews and Edinburgh Universities (1884), 233 *fol.*; description of his preaching University sermon at St. Andrews, 236; part in Seabury Commemoration (1884), 238; death of Bishop Christopher Wordsworth (1885), 240; relation of the brothers, 241; death of Provost Burton (1885), 265; V. L. Rorison becomes Provost, 265; Lord Glasgow's failure, *ib.*; last change of residence to 'Kilrymont' on the Scores (1887), 252; moving of Library, 253; frequent visits to Rydal, 256; deaths of Mr. Macdonald and J. R. Wordsworth (1890), 267; death of Dean Johnston and appointment of Provost Rorison as Dean (1890), 268; A. S. Aglen of Alyth made Archdeacon, definition of his duties, 268-69; severe illness, 270; speaks at Glenalmond Jubilee (1891), 271; publishes 'Annals,' vol. i., its rapid success, 271; receives Episcopal Chair and Pastoral Staff, (Easter Eve, 1892), 273; last Charge delivered in absence (5 Oct. 1892), 275; untoward incident after it, 276 *fol.*; last illness and death (5 Dec. 1892), 278; impressive funeral service in Cathedral yard, St. Andrews, 279; epitaph, 280; character of the Bishop, 18-20; faith and patience, 81; natural impetuosity, 195, 203, 338; eager-

WORDSWORTH

ness and sensitiveness, 338; desire for completeness, 18, 97, 135; orderliness, 228, 253, 318; affectionateness, 130; athletic and sanguine temper, 18, 182, 307, 308, 310, 312; judgments of friends respecting him: Lord Selborne, 195, 338; Canon Farquhar, 282, 283, 318, 336; Dr. Danson, 280-82; Professor Cooper, 284; Bishop of Glasgow (Harrison), 282.

§ II. *Episcopal work in Scotland*
A. *General.* B. *Diocesan.*

A. *General.*— Moves for a General Synod (1859), 149; Committee on Canons, 150; Synod meets (1862), 151; proposed Canon on elections leads to his withdrawal and offer of resignation, 151 *fol.*; correspondence with Tulloch, 'A Plea for Justice' (1865-66), 160; educational projects, 162 *fol.*: see § IV.; takes part in the foundation of Inverness Cathedral (1866), 173; supports resolution to permit a consecration for Natal in Scotland (1868), 187; explanation of his position, 188; question of archiepiscopal title, 189, 251; urges the extension of the powers of laymen in Synods, 193; with partial success, 194; supports Bishop Ewing's action in preaching in University Church, Glasgow, 197; Mr. Humble's presentment of him to Episcopal Synod dismissed (1873), 200; moves for a General Synod on subject of Cathedrals, Trinity College, Glenalmond, and regular meetings of General Synod (1875), 208; remarks on the removal of Divinity students from Glenalmond, 209; General Synod meets and establishes Representative Church Council (1876), 210; sermon at Dedication Festival of St. Paul's, Dundee (1878), 379; difference with the Primus as to his oversight of the French Old Catholics (1879), 278, 379; sermon at consecration of Edinburgh Cathedral, 224, 225; assists in consecration of the Bishop of Aberdeen (1883), 380; 'The Bishop of Liverpool in Scotland' (1883),

WORDSWORTH

381; position at Seabury Commemoration (1884), 288-40; Bishop Jermyn made Primus (1886), 246; 'Jubilee Tract for Scotland' and 'On Question of a Metropolitan' (1887), 250-51; on 'Revision of Scotch Communion Office' (1889), 78, 384 [on p. 78, l. 4, for 'printed' read 'separately published']; sermon at General Synod (1890), 267-68; cordial relations with his colleagues, 268; work of General Synod, 269-70; takes part in Jubilee of Trinity Coll. (1891), 271

B. *Diocesan.* Cp. § III. and § IV.

Description of the Diocese. See chap. II. Statistics of, 33, 192 foll., 275 foll., 386, Appendix VIII. Church work at:—

Alyth, 73, 192, 386
 Auchterarder, 66, 193
 Balgowan, 193
 Birnam, 80, 192, 386
 Blair Atholl, 193
 Blairgowrie, 73, 387
 Bridge of Allan, 192, 386
 Burntisland, 378, 387
 Callander, 192, 386
 Comrie, 66, 334, 381, 387
 Cortachy, 193, 387
 Coupar-Angus, 387
 Crieff, 192, 381, 384, 386
 Croiscraig, 192
 Cromlix, 386
 Culross, 386
 Cupar-Fife, 192, 386
 Dollar, 192, 387
 Doune, 192, 387
 Dunblane, 28
 Duncrub, 158, 192, 386
 Dunfermline, 29, 387
 Dunkeld, 28, 80: see Birnam
 Dunning, 192
 Dupplin Castle, 192
 Elie, 192
 Forfar, 29, 33, 73, 208, 265, 387
 Glamis Castle, 29, 193, 387
 Glenalmond, 35
 Glenalmond (Trinity College),
 4, 5, 6, 9, 16, 17, 81, 208, 271,
 334, 368, 371, 379, 386
 Kinclaven, 193
 Kinloch-Rannoch, 192, 386
 Kinross, 387

WORDSWORTH

Kirkcaldy, 386-7
 Leven, 192, 387; sermon at, 380
 Meigle, 73, 192, 386
 Memus, 193, 387
 Muthill, 33, 64 foll., 73
 Newport, 334, 337, 387
 Perth, St. Ninian's: see § III.;
 other churches, 56, 170; St.
 Andrew's School Chapel, 170,
 375, 376, 377, 386
 Pitlochry, 192, 386
 Pittenweem, 337
 Strath-tay, 73, 193, 386-7
 St. Andrews, 28, 207, 221 foll.,
 273, 381, 297-304, 386
 Tummel Bridge, 193
 Weem, 192, 378, 386

§ III. *Eucharistic controversy and St. Ninian's.*

See Scottish Office, Burton, Cheyne, Forbes, Fortescue, Humble, Lendrum. — Charles Wordsworth's position before he became Bishop, 9; 'Three Short Sermons' on Holy Communion, 10, 67-73, 75; beginnings of the controversy in England (1854), 66; introduced by Bishop Forbes into Scotland (1857), 84; his part in the Eucharistic controversy, 96; relation to Bishop Forbes, 97; opinion on his Charge on its appearance, 98; strong feeling against non-communicating attendance, 98 f.; 'Statement' in concert with Bishop Eden, 100, cp. 99 n.; 'Pastoral Letter' to Laity' (February, 1858), 101; drafts Synodal Letter, 108; its character, 109, 349; letter to Sir A. Edmonstone on, 111; 'Notes to assist on Euch. Controversy,' 115-18; 'Supplement to Notes,' 122; 'Opinion' on Mr. Cheyne's first appeal, 120; affirms his suspension, 123; rupture with Cathedral Clergy, 124; on celebration with one communicant, 125; discussion of statutes, 127; retires from Cathedral for twelve years (1859-72), 128; Charge of 1859, 129; pamphlets of Humble and Lendrum, 130; anonymous 'Proposals for Peace,' 131; interview with Keble, 133; 'Opinion'

WORDSWORTH

on Bishop Forbes' case, 134; G. Forbes on it, 136; Charles Wordsworth's notes on the case, 135-38; on Melchizedekian Priesthood of Christ, 139-40; doctrine complained of disturbs the proportions of the faith, 98, 140; renewed troubles at St. Ninian's, 197; Mr. Burton Provost (1871-1885), 198; Charge of 1872, a censure of St. Ninian's, 199; Special Synod of 1873, proposed Committee, 201; address by Dean and other clergy, 202; various circulars, 202; *modus vivendi* with Provost Burton (1874), 204; its partial success, 204; letters on the Eastward position. 205, cp. Appendix IV., 360, and 377, 378; changes in 1878, 264; happier relations, Mr. Hodson, supernumerary, 264; Charges again delivered in the Cathedral, 1882 onward, 265; Mr. Farquhar succeeds Mr. Hodson, 265; V. L. Rorison Provost (1885), 265; Lord Glasgow's failure a blessing in disguise, 265; enlargement, 265-66; recognised by Canon (1890), 266, 270; Bishop's satisfaction, 266; verses to G. T. Farquhar, 267.

§ IV. *Reunion Work.* See especially chapters V and VII.

General policy, 37-39; principles of Church polity, 230 foll.; details of: accepts Presbyterian Baptism, 58; how far he insisted on Confirmation, 63 *n.*; suggests the validity, under circumstances, of their orders, 237 *f.*; arguments on, 242-44; in letter to Archbishop Benson, 253-55; in Lambeth Conference Committee, 257-59; and Appendix VI., 363-66; preaching in Presbyterian churches, 38, 39, 197, 233-36, 245, 247-49, 259 foll.; appreciation of some features of Presbyterian polity, 33, 34, 222, 231; efforts for 'a common Catechism,' 163-65; 'a National Catechism,' 165-66; final defence of Reunion policy, 275-77; reference to it in his epitaph, 280

WORDSWORTH

§ V. *Public work in England.*

Assists at Consecrations of T. L. Claughton to Rochester (1867), 174; of Christopher Wordsworth to Lincoln (1869), 196-97; of H. Mackenzie to Nottingham (1870), 210; Confirmations at Radley and Stanford in the Vale, 174; part in Lambeth Conferences of 1867, 175; of 1878, 224, 353 foll.; of 1888, 253-59, 363-66; takes part in New Testament revision (1870-1881), 211-15; At Church Congress, Wolverhampton, 178; at Church Congress, Carlisle, sermon and paper (1884), 382; sermons at Oxford, 'Mending of Nets' (1857), 372, 239 foll.; and 'Doctrine of the Trinity' (1873), 378; Kidderminster, 'Reunion of Church of Great Britain' (1862), 156-59; Stratford, on Shakespeare (1864), 169, 374; Chichester, 'Euodias and Syntyche' (1867), 159, 177, 376; Norwich, 1870 (Choral Festival) and 1875, 210, 211, 376; Peterborough (1870), 210; St. Albans (Choral Festival), 1871, 211, 376; Rochester (1872), 210; Salisbury, 1872 and 1876 (reopening of choir), 210, 279, 378; Durham (1873), 210; Chester (1876), 210

§ VI. *Literary work (general).*

See especially 334-5, and Appendix VII.

A. *Theological.* Charge on modern teaching on Old Testament Canon, 271 foll.; on value of Book of Common Prayer, 246 foll.; works on the Christian Ministry, 38; lectures on, 81; Synodal address (1866), 159, 216-219: see also § IV.; 'A Common Catechism and 'a National Catechism,' 163-60; addition to Church Catechism, 224; and Appendix iii., 358-60; Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism, 240; Lord Bute's 'Breviary,' 225; 'Papal Aggression in the East,' 82

B. *Secular.* Greek Grammar and Primer, 167-68; 'Pindar and Modern Athletics,' 310; Statius,

WORDSWORTH

219; books on Shakespeare, 168-70; 'Waverley Novels in Chronological Order,' Appendix V., 362; Wordsworth Society, 302; on Tennyson's 'Timbuctoo,' 322 f.; Three great Orators of Antiquity, 334

C. *Judgments on men and books.*

Jeremy Taylor, 171; Baxter, 316; Lord Clarendon, 316 f.; J. H. Newman, 314 f.; Keble's 'Christian Year,' 172; Archbishop Trench, 315; Gladstone's 'Ellen Middleton,' 318

§ VII. *Verses by Charles Wordsworth.* On the 'Times' and the 'Scotsman,' 173; epitaph on Kenneth Wordsworth, 181; to Canon Farquhar, 267; to Dean Ramsay, 290 f.; to Lord Beaconsfield, 291 f.; on Dean Stanley's versions, 295; Sophocles' thanks to Lewis Campbell, 297; to the same on his recovery from bronchitis, 298; to Dr. Boyd, 299; elegy on Principal Tulloch, 300; to Agnata Ramsay, 302; 'The Scarlet Gown,' 303; to Dr. Macgregor, 305; to Rev. N. Johnston, 305; translation of some lines of Statius, 320; to Bishop Claughton on his birthday, 324; on his golden wedding, 325; to Bishop and Mrs. Moberly on theirs, 325; on 'Nightmare,' 327; translation of 'Our Blessed Redeemer,' 331; and of 'Thine for ever' and 'Lead, kindly Light,' 332. See also 360 (Archbishop Benson), 374 (1863), 380 (1880), 384 (1890)

Wordsworth, Charles Samuel, the Bishop's eldest son, curate of Kidderminster, 204; career and family of, 388

Wordsworth, Christopher (Master of Trinity), 1; death, 4; on Keble's 'Christian Year,' 172

Wordsworth, Christopher (Bishop of Lincoln), 1 n.; letter on the Six Bishops' Pastoral, 111; on 'a

WORDSWORTH

Common Catechism,' 164; appointed Bishop of Lincoln, 196; on Charles Wordsworth's proposed resignation, 203; death of, 240; on his brother's efforts, 241

Wordsworth, Christopher (Canon, Rector of St. Peter's, Marlborough), his book on 'University Life,' 326

Wordsworth, John (Fellow of Trinity), 1 n.

Wordsworth, John (Bishop of Salisbury), at Winchester, 181; visits to Scotland, 241 and Preface ix-x; consecration as Bishop, 246 n.; letter from, 255; debt to Charles Wordsworth's criticism, 326; chapter of this book written at Osmington, 288, 342; opinions on questions discussed, Preface x-xi; on ministry of Baptism, 60-63; on crucial point in Scottish office, 78-79; on Eucharistic Adoration and Sacrifice, 140-47; on Catechism, 166; on use of Revised Version, 215-16; on Presbyterian ordination, 260-64; translations by, 174, 180; Stanley's 'Valediction,' 296; Sophocles to L. Campbell, 297-98; to A. K. H. Boyd, 299; on Tulloch, 301; 'The Scarlet Gown,' 304; to Macgregor and Johnston, 305; Bishop Moberly's golden wedding, 325; 'Nightmare,' 329

Wordsworth, John Roundell, 267 and 387

Wordsworth, Robert Walter, the Bishop's second son translates Greek Primer, 168; letter on his father's funeral, 297; Preface v, and Appendix IX., 388

Wordsworth, William (the Poet), sponsor to Charles Wordsworth, 2; description of Scottish character, 35; his love of a terrace, 82

Wordsworth, William Barter, Preface v, xxvi, and App. IX., 389

For other members of the family see Preface v, 5, 64, 65, 80, 81, (Kenneth) 180-81, 203, 222, 252, 267, 278, 327, 336-7, 388-9

WORKS BY JOHN WORDSWORTH, D.D.

BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

PRAYERS FOR USE IN COLLEGE. 16mo. 1s.

THE ONE RELIGION. Bampton Lectures for 1881.
Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE HOLY COMMUNION: Four Visitation Addresses.
Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

CONSIDERATIONS ON PUBLIC WORSHIP AND
ON THE MINISTRY OF PENITENCE. With PASTORAL
LETTER. 8vo. 1s.

(Longmans, Green, & Co.)

NOUUM TESTAMENTUM DOMINI NOSTRI IESU
CHRISTI LATINE, secundum Editionem S. HIERONYMI.
The Four Gospels. (Ed. with Rev. H. J. WHITE.) 4to.
£2. 12s. 6d.

(University Press, Oxford. 1898.)

MANUAL OF THE SALISBURY DIOCESAN GUILD.
Price 6d.

(Brown & Co., Salisbury. 1898.)

ON THE RITE OF CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES,
ESPECIALLY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. A
Lecture before the Church Historical Society. Together with
the FORM and ORDER in use in the Diocese of Salisbury.

[*In the press.*]

(S. P. C. K.)

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01046 0055